

PATRIOT UNIVERSITY

DISSERTATION FOR DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

A PROJECT SUBMITTED TO
DR. WAYNE KNIGHT

SUBMITTED BY
KENT HOVIND
PENSACOLA, FLORIDA
MAY 25, 1991

Dedication page

I can think of many people who have been influential in the production of this book.

Miss Kim Van Gundy spent countless hours typing, correcting and retyping the manuscript.

My Mom and Dad supplied the computer for this work to be done on. There have been many times they financially supported my ministry.

My wife has put up with me reading well into the night many, many times. She has also patiently let me spend hundreds of hours on the phone gathering information and scheduling meetings. In those hundreds of moments when I thought of not completing this work, she encouraged me to go on.

My three children; Kent Andrew, Eric and Marlissa have often traveled with me as I preach on the subject of dinosaurs and the Bible. They have been a great help to me as we set up (and later pack up) three tables full of books, bones, tapes, maps and graphs for each meeting.

Patriot University inspired me to continue my education by making it possible for me to study at my own pace and complete this thesis as I could.

Hundreds of pastors and laymen have encouraged me to continue on in this unusual and unique ministry.

Many science teachers and writers have left their mark in my life. Some of these have been evolutionists and some have been creationists.

Most of all I must thank my Lord Jesus Christ for patiently working with me and equipping me for the work of the ministry. I marvel that He has counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry.

Kent Hovind

5-25-91

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is Kent Hovind. I am a creation/science evangelist. I live in Pensacola, Florida. I have been a high school science teacher since 1976. I've been very active in the creation/evolution controversy for quite some time. As an evangelist, God has given me the opportunity to preach and teach the wonderful story of His marvelous creation over 400 times each year to churches, schools (public and private), parent groups, youth groups, on the radio, and in university debates.

It is my burning desire to help Christians get back to a simple faith in God's Word. Satan's method has always been to instill doubt in God's Word. The first sentence that came from Satan that is recorded for us in the Bible is: "Yea, hath God said?" He started by questioning God's Word in the garden of Eden. It worked there so he has used it ever since.

In the twentieth century the major attack Satan has launched has been against the first eleven chapters of Genesis. He knows that the entire Bible stands or falls on the validity of these chapters. I believe that the Bible is the infallible, inerrant, inspired, perfect Word of God. I believe that the Bible needs to be read and believed as it stands. Christians are often guilty of neglecting or twisting the Bible to fit their lifestyle or their preconceived ideas.

In this book I'll be covering, in a nutshell, the creation/evolution controversy. I will explain why it is so important, the effects that the theory of evolution has had on our society, the creation alternative, and what we should do about the problem. I will try to answer questions that modern science has raised from a Scriptural viewpoint.

I am, without apology, a Bible-believing Christian. I have been saved for twenty-two years by the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son. I believe that God's Word is infallible and flawless in every detail. If the Bible says that something was created a certain way, then that is just the way it happened. Now, as a science teacher, I want to keep an open mind and understand why, how, and when God created the earth, if those things can be known. There are some things we cannot understand, and some things I believe that we can.

I will be quick to point out that "there is nothing new under the sun." Most of my ideas are the result of the input of hundreds of Godly men and women through the years. I have attempted in this book to simply explain the things I have learned through many years of studying both science and the Bible.

In the last twenty-two years I have read hundreds of books by creationists and evolutionists alike on the subject of origins. Many great thinkers and scientists have had an influence on me. I owe much to many, but I must in the final analysis, take the blame/credit for what

is written in this book. Many things I can document and verify with the "experts" (whatever an expert is). Some things in this book I couldn't prove to anyone. I only ask that you realistically look at the ideas presented and ask yourself the simple question, "does this key open the lock, does this answer the question?" If it does--it just might be right.

Only God knows all the details of how it really happened. I believe He has revealed many details about the original creation in His book the Bible. Everything else we come up with down here is just our theory.

My weekly radio broadcast has been instrumental in answering a number of questions about the creation/evolution controversy. I have tried to answer questions as thoroughly and scripturally as I know how. Each broadcast dealt with a different topic. We have selected some of the most helpful topics and developed them into chapters toward this book. The chapters, and consequently the subject matter of the book, begins by discussing the history of evolution. Where did we get this crazy idea anyway? The second chapter deals with the fact that evolution is a religion and not a science, and therefore, should be excluded from public school curriculum. The third chapter deals with the effects of evolution. What has the teaching of evolution brought to the world in the way of good or harm? In the fourth chapter we deal with the subject of time. How old is the earth? In the fifth chapter we

discuss the Big Bang theory. In the sixth chapter we give information about the Geologic Column, the foundation of all evolutionary teaching. In chapter seven we answer questions about radio carbon dating. Chapter eight gives the truth about cave men. Chapter nine discusses the "best evidence" evolutionists have for evolution, that is, archaeopteryx. Chapter ten answers the question, "Has science created life in the laboratory?" We took ten chapters of the book to destroy the edifice of evolution, and clear away the rubble so that we could build on a clean foundation.

Several legitimate questions about the creation account given in the Bible need to be answered. Number one, "Don't all scientists believe in evolution?" In chapter eleven we discuss scientists, past and present, who were creationists. In chapter twelve, we answer a commonly raised complaint, "Genesis 1 conflicts with Genesis 2." In chapter thirteen we give interesting evidence that dinosaurs are mentioned in the Bible. I believe that dinosaurs are not only in the Bible, but they have lived with man all through his six thousand year history. In chapter fourteen we deal with the question, "Are dinosaurs extinct?" In chapter fifteen we discuss the human and dinosaur footprints found together in Glen Rose, Texas. In chapter sixteen we give the creationists' alternative theory to explain the geologic features of the earth within a six thousand year framework.

While all of the evidence is not in yet, I feel it is still the best option to take God's word at face value. The Bible has never been proven wrong yet, and I believe it never will be.

THE HISTORY OF EVOLUTION

Where in the world did the idea come from that things left to themselves can improve with time? Who would start a crazy idea like that? This idea is the opposite of everything that we observe in the world today. For instance, all the highways in our nation today left to themselves decay, deteriorate, and fall apart. A house left to itself will become a wreck. It takes work and constant planning to make anything improve. Everything tends toward disorder. The first and second laws of thermodynamics are well established scientific laws that have never been observed in the universe to be broken. The first law says that matter cannot be created nor destroyed by ordinary means. We do not see anything being created today, and yet we do see an entire universe of created material. This clearly indicates a Creator. There are people in the world today who wish to avoid the concept of God. They do not like the idea of a God telling them what to do. Therefore, they have come up with the most dangerous, damnable doctrine ever imagined, evolution. I would like in this chapter to trace the history of evolutionary doctrine. Where did this dangerous doctrine come from?

Evolution is purely a religion. There is no scientific evidence at all to back up any form of macro-evolution.

The technical definition of evolution means "change." There is no question that things do change. All change is directed either downward toward less order if left to themselves, or upward with a master-mind behind it. The cities that we live in have 'evolved' over the years. The city where you are now probably did not even exist three hundred years ago. A college professor told me that cities 'evolve' with time. I said to him, "I agree. If you use this as your definition of 'evolved' then you are including a design, a designer, and lots of work--planned intelligent progress, not chaos ordered by self. Not one of the buildings in your city built itself by the material rising up out of the ground." It did not happen that way. It does not ever happen that way. It never will happen that way. It requires intelligence and a designer.

When I speak of evolution, I am not referring to small minor changes that naturally occur as animals have to make some adjustments to their environment. For instance, if we released hundreds of rabbits in an area with cold winters, only the animals with the heavier fur would survive. So within a few years, the population would have a little heavier fur than the earlier populations. These small minor population shifts brought about by environment are referred to as 'micro-evolution.' There has been no change in the genetic material of the rabbit. There has only been a change in the ratio of the population. You still have the same kind of animal. If that climate were

to change back to a milder climate, the population of animals would change back to having a lighter fur.

Macro-evolution would be defined as changing into a different kind of animal. There is no similarity between micro-evolution and macro-evolution. Many evolutionists will use micro-evolution to try to prove that macro-evolution is true. We must guard ourselves not to fall for this false logic.

The idea that evolutionists try to get across today is that there is a continual upward progression. They claim that everything is getting better, improving, all by itself as if there is an inner-drive toward more perfection and order. This is totally opposite of the first and second law of thermodynamics. It goes against all scientific evidence that has been accumulated. Yet, this lie is what many men believe today. We don't see it happening anywhere in our universe today. We don't see any evidence of this in the fossil record.

I would like to trace the history of evolution beginning with the fall of Satan from heaven, through the last six thousand years, to modern-day evolution, and explain what those teaching this doctrine have planned for the future.

To really understand the history of evolution, we have to understand the author. Satan is the master-mind behind this false doctrine. He was thrown out of heaven because of his desire to exalt himself to godhood. One of

the underlying reasons that evolution appeals to so many people is because it appeals to man's pride. Isaiah 13:11 says, "I will cause the arrogance of the proud to cease and will lay low the haughtiness of the proud." God is against pride. In Isaiah 14:12-14 the Bible tells us of the fall of Satan from heaven.

How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which didst weaken the nations! For thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God: I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north. I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High.

Later on in the passage God says that He will cast down Lucifer.

I personally believe that Satan fell from heaven about a hundred years after the creation of Adam and Eve. I believe that he had watched Adam and Eve have fellowship with their creator with pride and envy in his heart. He had been God's choir director since he was created. His desire to be God was thwarted when God cast him out of heaven.

Ezekiel 28 tells of Ezekiel taking up a prophesy against Tyrus. It is obvious from the context that the king of Tyre is a picture or a type of Satan. Ezekiel 28:2-5, 17 says,

Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the Lord God; Because thine heart is lifted up (here we see the pride) and thou hast said, I am a god, I sit in the seat of God in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God,

though thou set thine heart as the heart of God;
Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no
secret that they can hide from thee;
With thy wisdom and with thy understanding thou
hast gotten thee riches, and hast gotten gold and
silver into thou treasures;
By thy great wisdom and by thy traffick hast thou
increased thy riches...

Thine heart was lifted up because of thy beauty,
thou hast corrupted thy wisdom by reason of thy
brightness: I will cast thee to the ground, I
will lay thee before kings, that they may behold
thee.

Tyrus is a type of Satan who lifted his heart up. Pride is mentioned repeatedly in the Bible as being one of the main things that God hates. I have noted several hundred references to pride that show God's attitude toward it. He hates it!! Here are several.

- Lev. 26:19 "I will break the pride of your power,"
- I Sam. 2:3 "talk no more so exceedingly proudly"
- Psalms 10:2 "The wicked in his pride doth persecute the poor"
- Psalms 10:4 "The wicked through the pride of his countenance will not seek after God.."
- Psalms 73:6 "Pride compasses them about as a chain;..."
- Ps. 101:5 "Him that hath an high look and a proud heart will I not suffer."
- Ps. 119:21 "Thou hast rebuked the proud..."
- Prov. 6:16 "These six things doth the Lord hate... a proud look."
- Prov. 8:13 "Pride, and arrogancy...do I hate."
- Prov. 13:10 "Only by pride cometh contention."
- Prov. 15:25 "The Lord will destroy the house of the proud..."

Prov. 16:5 "Every one that is proud in the heart is an abomination to the Lord..."

Prov. 16:8 "Pride goeth before destruction..."

Prov. 21:4 "An high look, and a proud heart...is sin."

Is. 14:12-16 Satan's fall "I will ascend..."

Jer. 9:23 "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom neither let the mighty man glory in his might; let not the rich man glory in his riches..."

Obed. 3 "Pride...hath deceived thee."

Matt 23:6 "Love the uppermost rooms at feasts."

Matt. 23:12 "Whosoever shall exhalt himself shall be abased."

Mark 7:21 "From within...proceed evil thoughts... pride..."

Luke 1:51 "He scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts."

Rom 1:22-30 "Professing themselves to be wise... proud..."

I Cor. 8:1 "Knowledge puffeth up..."

I Cor. 13:4 "Charity...is not puffed up..."

I Tim. 3:6 "...lifted up with pride ye fall into..."

II Tim. 3:2 "Men shall be lovers of their own selves...proud..."

James 4:6 "God resisteth the proud."

I Jn. 2:16 "...pride of life..."

There you have just a few of the many verses in the Bible that deal with pride. God hates pride. In his pride, Satan decided he would exalt himself and take over the throne of God. This is where evolution started. It

started in heaven in the heart of Satan. Satan and a number of angels that followed him were cast down to the earth. Then we have the story repeated in the heart of man. Man is trying to exalt himself. This is what evolution is teaching today, that man is the pinnacle, the ultimate.

When Satan realized he could not take over the throne of God, he decided to destroy what God had created instead. Satan, in the form of a serpent, brought the doctrine of evolution to the Garden of Eden. In Genesis 3:5 the serpent says to Eve, "...ye shall be as gods." Pride is the same thing that Satan used to cause the fall of man in the Garden of Eden. Satan was jealous of Adam and Eve and their close union with God. The same is true today. Satan wants your attention any time you try to serve the Heavenly Father. When Adam and Eve fell for the line that they could become as gods, the doctrine of evolution was successfully introduced to the world. Man's pride and ego had been appealed to and he was no longer content with the status God had given him.

Where did it go from there? Genesis 4:3 says, "And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord." Cain knew better. God wanted a blood sacrifice. God had shed innocent blood to cover the sin of Adam and Eve. Cain knew God wanted a bloody animal sacrifice, a lamb to be precise. Cain thought that he could get favor with God by bringing

the work of his own hands. Cain promoted the evolutionary doctrine that man can progress by his own efforts. It was Cain's pride that caused him to disregard God's commands to bring a lamb. Instead he brought the fruit of the ground which represents his own efforts to please God. When God rejected his offer, he became angry at God. Since he could not hurt God, he took out his anger on God's servant, his brother. In pride, he slew his brother because his brother's sacrifice was accepted. We are told later in the New Testament the reason why Cain killed his brother. In I John 3:12 we read, "Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous." This is still true today. Anyone that does good in this world is hated by those that do evil. Cain's efforts to "evolve" closer to God met with disaster. Cain was driven out from his family to wander in the world. His descendants apparently continued rejecting God. Man full of pride will seldom admit that he is wrong.

The evil in the world continued to get worse until God had to destroy the inhabitants of the earth with a flood. When the Flood was over, Satan began to work on Noah's descendants. The story of evolution continues in Gen. 9:22, "And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father, and told his two brethren without." Ham, instead of doing the wise thing of covering up his father's nakedness, went out and laughed about it to

his two brothers, evidently. This resulted in a curse being placed upon Ham's son, Caanan. Ham's pride caused him to try to make his father look bad. People who are always cutting down others are usually motivated by pride. They think making someone else look worse will some how make themselves look better.

The story continues in Genesis 10. The people had been commanded by God to spread out and replenish the earth. Some decided instead to rebel against God's authority and exalt themselves. Genesis 10:8-9 says, "And Cush begat Nimrod; he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord." The word 'before' in that verse means "in the face of the Lord", or "against the Lord." Nimrod's rebellion against the Lord caused him to begin construction of the Tower of Babel. We see this tower mentioned in Gen. 11:1-9:

And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech.
And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there.
And they said one to another, Go to, let us make brick, and burn them thoroughly. And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar.
And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.
And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded.
And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do; and now nothing will be restrained from

them, which they have imagined to do.
Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech.
So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city.
Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth; and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.

This tower represented man's desire to exalt himself to the seat of God. The pride of the rebels caused the people to want to disobey God. They wanted to stay together and build big cities even though God had commanded them to spread out and fill the earth.

Babylon was one of the first cities built after the flood. It still exists today. The people reluctantly spread out after God judged them by confusing the languages. At this point they spoke all different languages because the Lord "confounded their speech." I'm sure for several generations they told stories about how it used to be in the 'good old days' when there was just one big city and everyone was one happy family.

As we trace the history of evolution, it becomes slightly confusing at this point because there are going to be several different branches on the tree. I will focus on just two of the main branches.

When the people left the Tower of Babel, they took their false religion of evolution with them. They still hoped that they could exalt themselves to godhood. For the sake of the study, we shall call them the Eastern and

Western branches of evolution.

In the European community, actually in area of Asia Minor and the country of Turkey, we have the Western branch of evolution. In the countries of China, Japan, and India the Eastern branch of evolution developed. The branches actually developed simultaneously.

The Flood was about 2400 B.C. which makes it about 4400 years ago. The Tower of Babel was probably built within the first three to five hundred years after the flood. Let's just assume that it was about 1900 B.C. when the Tower of Babel was built. The people were scattered from the Tower. Many of the people, in their pride, still tried to find some way to become their own god. This is the basic motive behind evolution.

For the next several hundred years following the Tower of Babel, there were many evolutionary-type myths passed down from generation to generation. In the year 640 B.C. a fellow named Thales was born in Asia Minor. At some point in his life he began the first of the modern evolutionary doctrines. He said that man had evolved from animals, animals had come from plants, plants had come from inorganic elements, and all of these had come from water. Anaximander, one of the students of Thales, enlarged on this theory slightly. Anaximander lived from 611 to 547 B.C. He taught Pythagoras, who is famous for the Pythagorean theorem used in mathematics.

At this point, there was a split in the evolutionary doctrine. One group became atheistic, and said that there was no God. Pythagoras started the group that became pantheistic. He said there had to be a God based on the design he saw in nature, but the god that he saw was the god in nature. The idea of limiting God to the natural elements is the underlying theme of pantheism. He lived from 580 to 489 B.C. He believed that nature is divine.

There are basically three types of religions in the world. The first type is atheism which says that there is no God. Psalm 14:1 calls the people who believe there is no God fools. The second type of religion is pantheistic which says that nature is god. This group says that the universe is in control of itself and knows what it wants to accomplish. Pantheism imparts a divine nature to the elements. The third type of religion says that God is outside of, above, and beyond His creation. He is not limited by His creation in any way. This is the almighty infinite God of the Bible.

Socrates was a pantheist Greek philosopher who lived from 469 to 399 B.C. Socrates did not leave many writings, but his student Plato wrote prolifically. Plato, like his teacher Socrates, was definitely a pantheist. He also believed that nature is god. Munitz from his book Theories of the Universe, pg. 61 says,

Plato also makes use of another analogical pattern of thought in describing the universe as an all-inclusive Living Creature, one whose body is perfectly spherical and whose soul animates the whole world. In addition to this World-Soul, the various individual heavenly bodies are regarded by Plato as divine beings.

In the writings of Plato, we have a very definite description of the great chain of being, or an order of the world soul. He taught that the universe is a living creature in itself. Plato's idea was not one of ascension in evolution, but one of descending. He thought that it went from God to man and on down to the atomic particles. His idea of putting everything in a nice neat order came from Socrates. Plato developed this further into the great chain of being.

Democritus lived from 460 to 362 B.C. He started a school called the Atomist school. Democritus coined the word 'atom.' He thought that the interplay of atomic particles was all that was necessary to describe how the universe got here (the same basic idea as is taught in modern evolution).

Next we come to a student of Plato named Aristotle. He lived from 384 to 322 B.C. Aristotle developed the "Scale of Being." He believed in reincarnation which teaches that after death you would return to earth as a new being, either higher or lower, depending on how you behaved during your present life. This is very similar to the modern-day Eastern religions. He developed the idea of a

"world soul" more fully and passed it on to many more of his students. Aristotle believed in a descending order of nature. He believed in the "eternal cosmos" which says that nature has always existed. He believed in spontaneous generation which says that life arose from non-life. Aristotle is known for many scientific discoveries, and no doubt, had a great positive impact on the world of science. However, his god was not the God of the Bible. His god was nature.

Aristotle was tutor to a man named Alexander the Great. Alexander the Great was the leader of the Greek Empire of the third century B.C. He spread the teachings of Aristotle all around his empire.

These men are all part of the Western branch of the evolutionary doctrine. The Eastern branch was also developing during this same time. People had travelled from the Tower of Babel to the Eastern countries of India, Pakistan, and China. Civilizations began developing there.

Beginning around 500 B.C., there were at least five major religions that were developing in the East. The story gets a little confusing as we try to trace the history of evolution. Here in the Eastern branch we again have two basic philosophies of religion. One philosophy is atheistic, saying that there is no god at all. The other philosophy again was pantheistic, saying that nature is god.

Hinduism became very popular around 600 B.C. It probably began many years before that. This religion is broken up into four branches. Vedanta is the most popular branch. It teaches that the universe is a living soul. Sikhism is another branch that began around 1500 A.D. Janism is a branch of Hinduism that says that there is no god at all. Janism teaches the doctrine of Karma. This is a system of reincarnation where people are constantly being born back as a different creature depending upon how they lived in this world. The final stage of this reincarnation is Nirvana, which is annihilation and you finally get to stop coming back. You just cease to exist. The fourth branch is called Sankhya which is also atheistic.

Another religion developing in the Eastern world during this time was Confucianism. Confucius lived from 551 to 479 B.C. He very strongly endorsed ancestor worship. There was no god or after life in the system developed by Confucius. It was simply a system of ethical, political, and pragmatic teachings. It was a very atheistic religion that totally left God out.

Zoroaster was the religion of the Persians that developed around 600 B.C. Darius and Cyrus, who were both mentioned in the Bible, were followers of Zoroaster. It is quite possible that the wise men who came to Bethlehem were of this cult. There is no way to prove this for certain. This religion believed that Satan and God were equally powerful, thereby, limiting God. This shows that they did

not have the right view of God in their theology. This Eastern religion is still prominent today.

The Buddhist religion was also developing during this time in the East. Buddha lived from 563 to 480 B.C. Buddha means "the enlightened one." This religion originated in India, and was later expelled from that country. It later became very popular in China. Eventually, it merged with the teachings of Confucius, and became a sort of hodge-podge religion. It was a very atheistic religion. It had a very rigid system of Karma, which was a cause/affect system. By that I mean, he believed that your deeds in each incarnation, as they called it, were reflected in the next reincarnation. There is no mention in Buddhism of the original creation.

The fifth major Eastern religion that began in that time period was Taoism founded by Lao Tse. He lived from 604 to 517 B.C. This religion was a rival of Confuciusianism in China. "Taoism...was also an evolutionary religion, built around the concept of 'the Way.'" (The Long War Against God, p. 221) It was basically pantheistic in philosophy. Taoism teaches that nature is bi-polar. All of nature is divided into yin and yang. Yin is represented by water on the one end, and yang is represented by fire at the other end.

The five major Eastern religions that developed during this time were Hinduism, Confucianism, Zoroasterism, Buddhism, and Taoism. Because of the atheistic and

pantheistic philosophies of these religions, and the lack of importance placed on God, the entrance of communism into these countries was very simple. When the evolutionary doctrine was taught in these countries, the people did not have to change their religion in order to include it. Evolution and communism blended in fine with the Eastern religions. In about 1895, a man named Yen Fu translated Thomas Huxley's book into Chinese. That was probably the turning point in China. It led the way for communism to take over so many of the oriental countries.

At the time of Christ, it was almost universally accepted as "scientific fact" that the world was infinitely old. The two philosophies mentioned above were very prevalent during the development of the early church. These are the philosophies that were referred to in Col. 2:8 where the Bible says "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit." As the Apostle Paul was preaching on Mars Hill, he began his sermon by talking about the infinite creator, the God that made the worlds.

Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars' hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious. For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions, I found an altar with this inscription, TO THE UNKNOWN GOD, Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you. God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; (Acts 17:22-24)

This immediately got the people's attention. We are in

the same situation today. In order to reach people that have been heavily influenced by evolution, we must first begin with the foundation, the creation. We can't immediately quote John 3:16 because it sounds like a foreign language to them. They have been so brainwashed away from God by evolutionary philosophy that we must begin with the basics. We must slowly pry open their closed minds by getting them to answer the question, "Who is the Creator who made the world? "

Almost immediately after the time of Christ, several groups developed around Christianity that claimed to be Christian. Some had pure motives and some had impure motives. Those with impure motives desired to dilute and destroy the Christian teaching. For example, one of the groups that developed was from Alexandria, Egypt. There was a school in Alexandria that had teachers that tried to reinstate Aristotle's philosophy into Christianity. St Clement, who lived from approximately 150 to 215 A.D., taught in this Alexandrian school. He started one of the early compromises that tried to bring the Almighty God of the Bible down to the pantheist God of nature. You see the God of creation is above and outside of the creation whereas the god of pantheism is in his creation and is limited by the creation. Instead of him being over the universe, he is like a major cog in the machinery but not the man running the machinery. Clement had a very clear intention of making God a pantheist God. Evolution is just

part of a long war against God. The main idea is to bring God down off His throne. Satan has always wanted to do that and he hasn't given up yet.

Many in the Alexandrian school were of this philosophy. They actually re-copied parts of the Bible to be more in line with their beliefs and made what are known today as the Alexandrian manuscripts. These have been discredited and rejected by most Bible-believing Christians because there are differences in these manuscripts and the other manuscripts of the Bible. Many of the Alexandrian manuscripts are older than the manuscripts used by the Bible-believing Christians, yet older does not mean better. It would only make sense that if a manuscript were accepted as authentic by the believers that it would be used over and over until it was worn out. Then a new copy would be made. It would be checked extensively by the priests to verify that all had been copied correctly. They would even count the number of letters to verify that all was correct. Then the old copy would be destroyed. This process was repeated many times as manuscripts became unusable. Those manuscripts that were not accepted would not be used, and therefore, would last longer. The Alexandrian manuscripts are the source of many of the modern-day translations. Instead of going to the "original" manuscripts, the modern translators have been using the Alexandrian. This results in a perverting and watering down of the Scriptures.

Another very influential man in the Alexandrian school was a man by the name of Origen. He was born approximately 185 A.D. and died 256 A.D. Origen had a very vehement desire to put the evolutionary theory of pantheism into Christianity. He especially thought that Genesis 1 and 2 needed to be changed. He taught that they were an allegory, a myth. He said these two chapters were just a story to try to explain some of the processes God used and that they were not to be taken literally. The idea of Genesis 1 and 2 not being literally scientifically accurate and true probably has one of its major roots in the teachings of Origen. He is a key man in the history of evolution.

The next man in this history of evolution is a man by the name of Augustine. He was born approximately 353 A.D. and died about 430 A.D. He is called St. Augustine by the Catholic church. Augustine still plays a vital part in the Catholic church doctrine. He would be the equivalent of a theistic evolutionist today.

About 620 A.D., Mohammed, the founder of the religion of Islam, hated the polytheism that was around him at the time. One of his goals and desires was to develop a monotheistic religion. He developed an unusual mixture between Christianity and Judaism. He eventually became very anti-Christian. He wanted a limited God of nature, a pantheistic type of god. The god of Mohammedism is not the God of the Bible by any stretch of the imagination. It is

a little pantheistic god of nature. Because of this, the Islam religion accepts evolution very readily as a scientific fact because it fits so well with their teaching. In the country of Turkey (which is almost totally dedicated to Mohammed) evolution is taught as fact.

In 1225 A.D., a man was born named Thomas Aquinas. He was called "the angelic doctor." He continued Augustine's idea of the pantheist God. He was very influential in reviving Aristotle's teaching in the Catholic church. As a matter of fact, it became a law in the Catholic church that you must teach Aristotle's doctrine as far as the origin of the universe or you would be treated as a heretic.

In the early 1600's, Galileo invented the telescope. He looked at the moon and noticed the rugged surface of the moon. He then said that the moon was not smooth like Aristotle said it was. Aristotle had said back in 400 B.C. that the moon was like a perfect smooth sphere, a crystal ball to reflect the sunlight. Galileo even published a book that stated that the moon was not smooth. Aristotle was also contradicted by Galileo on his theory of gravity. Aristotle had said that heavier objects fall faster than lighter objects. Galileo proved that to be wrong. In the mid 1600's, Galileo, under penalty of death by the Catholic church, had to recant his awful heresy of teaching that the moon was not smooth. He had dared to suggest that the doctrines of Aristotle as taught by the

church could be wrong! He wrote a second book to say that he was wrong and that the moon was perfectly smooth. The priests even refused to look through Galileo's telescope because they said that it was demon possessed. The hold of Aristotle's philosophy on the minds of the people of that time was so strong that scientific progress was hindered. We face the same thing today. The faulty teaching of evolution is hindering scientific progress.

Thomas Aquinas was no doubt a very sincere man. However, he was sincerely wrong. He was a very influential person in the Renaissance which is called the "Great Awakening." He is often called the father of the Renaissance. This was a time for getting people to think again. They began to be sceptical of religion in general and the Catholic Church in particular.

The next influential character we come to in our tracing of the history of evolution is Benoit de Maillet. He was born in 1656 and died about 1738. He was very anti-Bible and tried to influence anyone he could to not believe the Bible. He was very full of occult ideas. He wrote a book which was his name spelled backward, Telliamed. He was a very avid atheist, evolutionist, and a materialist. He believed in a great infinite age of the earth. He was very influential in furthering the ideas of evolution, particularly in the country of France.

Another man at this time was Maupertis, born 1698, and died 1759. He was a physicist and a mathematician, and

was a close friend of Voltaire. Both of these men hated Christianity with a passion and wanted to do anything they could to discredit the Bible.

Voltaire, born 1694 and died in 1798, was a deist and was an open enemy of Christianity. When he was five years of age, he memorized "The Sceptics Poem", and on his death bed he said, "I am abandoned by God and man. I shall go to hell." He is also quoted as saying, "If God did not exist, it would be necessary for man to invent him." Many people in colleges today use this quote to pull people away from Christianity. Voltaire is also quoted as saying, "I wish I had never been born." He is also said to have scoffed at Sir Isaac Newton. Newton had been meditating on Daniel 12:4 which says, "But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." Newton said that he believed that someday man would go more than 50 miles per hour. Voltaire picked up on this and laughed. He then travelled around preaching about the ridiculous ideas in the Bible to put such thoughts into Newton's head. Voltaire had a deist friend as a young man named Abbe de Chateuneuf, a bachelor and probably a homosexual. During the French Revolution, Voltaire tried to establish a ten-day work week instead of a seven-day week just to try to get people away from the seven days of creation. This, of course, was a miserable failure. This is just an example of what he tried to do to get people

away from the Bible and from Christianity.

Another Frenchman during this time of turmoil of the 1600 and 1700's was a man named Comte de Buffon(1707-1788). He was the director of the French botanical Gardens for fifty years. He was also a prolific author. He wrote a 44 volume series on science called History of Nature. This is full of evolutionary ideas.

Before his writing before the French Revolution, he was very careful not to do things that would offend the Catholic Church. He was very influential in spreading the doctrine of evolution around the world.

Another man that is very important as we trace the history of evolution is Erasmus Darwin, the grandfather of Charles Darwin. He was born in 1731 and died in 1802. He was an extremely fat person. In fact, he was so fat they had to cut a curve in the dining room table so that he could get up to the table. He was a medical doctor. He was also very immoral. He had twelve legitimate children and two illegitimate children. He was known to have had many affairs. He was a great admirer of the French philosopher, Rousseau, who was the chief philosopher of the French Revolution. Darwin was a deist, not an atheist, but was a strong opponent of Christianity. In 1794 he wrote a book called Zoonomia, which contained many of the evolutionary ideas that were later claimed by Charles, his grandson. The United States and England were not yet ready to accept the evolutionary ideas because there was still

such a strong Christian influence. About 65 years later, his grandson, Charles, would get credit for modern ideas of evolution. Erasmus Darwin founded the Lunar Society in Birmingham, England in the late 1700's.

I think it is not a coincidence that people who are atheists or evolutionists frequently have a wicked lifestyle or at least a lifestyle against the plain teachings of the Bible. Therefore, evolution is an easy way for them to justify their lifestyle. The problem is one of philosophy, not one of science. They don't want there to be a God because of their wicked lifestyle. That is their real problem.

The next man with an influential part in this history of evolution was Jean-Baptiste de Lamarck, born in 1744, died in 1829. Lamarck wrote two famous books on zoology, one in 1809 and one in 1815. He was a French atheist. He was appointed by the French Revolutionary government. He was very bitterly anti-Bible and anti-Christian. He hated the Bible, especially the creation and the flood story. He was determined to give people an alternative explanation for how the earth got here beside the creation and the flood. He also was an immoral man. He had six illegitimate children by three different women. He taught a theory that giraffes had longer necks because they would stretch their necks to reach the leaves higher on the trees. Those that were not able to stretch would simply die out in times of drought. Then the long necks

giraffes would pass that trait on to their children. This is known as the "inheritance of acquired characteristics." There is no biologist today that believes this theory. Acquired traits are not inherited because they have no effect on the genetic matter. Lamarck died in poverty and was unwanted when he died.

One of the men greatly influenced by Lamarck was a man named Charles Lyell. Lyell was born in 1797 and died in 1875. He is called the father of modern geology. He was a lawyer, not a scientist. He developed what is called the "geologic column." This column is still taught in every earth science classroom today. The whole idea of the geologic column is based on uniformitarianism, or the present is the key to the past. This is mentioned in II Peter 3 where it says in the last days scoffers are going to come and they will say all things continue as they were. It goes on to say in II Peter 3 that they are willingly ignorant of the creation and the flood. The flood explains geology. The present processes do not explain geology. The Colorado River did not form the Grand Canyon. The Grand Canyon was formed as the flood went down. Lyell took the old philosophy of naturalism and applied it to earth history. Sadly, many of the creationists of his day accepted his philosophy. They thought it was time to update the Bible and some how make the Biblical account of creation include eons of time. Lyell cleverly trapped Christians of his day with his erroneous teaching. He

wrote a book called Principles of Geology. It was this book that influenced Charles Darwin while he was on his voyage on the HMS Beagle many years later. Lyell was Darwin's friend and urged him to publish his book, Origin of Species. Lyell had a determination to destroy the idea of the Biblical flood in the minds of people. He promoted the teaching of Hutton. Each of these men just built on each other's sinking foundation. There was a movement in the early 1800's to disarm the monarch system of government. They saw that the Bible taught that you should obey the king and therefore, the Bible stood in the way of democracy. They thought that by disproving the Bible they would be able to disarm the monarchists. They had political goals, not scientific goals, for teaching uniformitarianism. Lyell often ridiculed what he called "Mosaic geology." He was very shrewd and therefore, never openly attacked the Bible. Henry Morris in his book Long War Against God, pg. 65 says, "Lyell's dominating motivation was his desire to undermine the authority of the Bible."

The next man we come to in tracing the history of evolution is a man by the name of Charles Darwin. Darwin was born in 1809 and died in 1882. He is most famous for two books that he authored. The second one was The Descent of Man. The first one, and most famous, is The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection. This book also had a subtitle called "The Preservation of the Favored Races in

the Struggle for Life." He took a five year voyage in the 1830's on the HMS Beagle. During that voyage, he read extensively Lyell's book. This greatly influenced him to think that the earth was millions of years old. When he returned from his voyage, he was encouraged by Lyell to publish a book. Darwin wrote for many years, but never published the book. Lyell realized that a man named Wallace was going to beat Darwin to the punch in publishing such a book on evolution. Lyell encouraged Darwin to go ahead and publish his book. Darwin published it in 1859. The Industrial Revolution was well under way and people were looking for some way to justify the cruelty that accompanied this revolution. (Child labor, sweat houses, etc.) Darwin's book was just what the world needed to justify the cruel ruthless tactics of the industrial revolution. Darwin had a theology degree. He became a deist, and later, very proudly an atheist. There are many stories of him repenting on his death bed, but there still is much confusion on the issue.

The next key character in the history of evolution is Karl Marx. Karl Marx was born in 1818 and died in 1883. He is known as the father of Communism. Karl Marx was very much influenced as a youngster by a man Auguste Comte. Comte, along with Herbert Spencer, James Frazier, Edward Taylor, and some others, were ardent Darwinists. They strongly promoted Darwin's teachings, particularly those on the evolution of religion. They began teaching back then

that even monotheism (the belief in one God) was the result of evolution. They said that man used to believe in many gods and gradually declined to just one god. They taught that religion actually evolved. This is a false teaching that is still promoted today in universities.

Marx was a very egotistical man. He had a definite hatred for God and the Bible. He was born into a rich family. He was a good friend of Friedrich Engels, a socialist leader in England. They believed that struggle is the means of development. Because of this belief, they thought that class struggle was good. By the time Darwin's book was published, Marx had already written several books and developed his revolutionary ideas. Even though Marx was rich, he claimed to take the cause of the poor class. By the way, in every Communist country today, there are still only two classes--the extremely rich and the extremely poor. Communism does not solve the problem that it claims it is going to solve; it only worsens the problem. Because of the idea of development by class struggle, Marx readily accepted Darwin's book when it was published in 1859. By December of 1859, just two months after Darwin's book was published, Marx and Engels were corresponding concerning Darwin's book. They said that it was exactly what they had been waiting for to justify their class struggle. Marx strongly emphasized that environmental influence, like Lamarck had discussed, (the belief that certain traits that are acquired can be passed

on genetically to the next generation), could affect the rate of evolution in humanity. He said that if the environment were changed, people would evolve faster. He thought that evolution could be controlled or accelerated then by handling factors in the environment. Marx wrote two very famous books that radically changed the world: The Communist Manifesto and Das Kapital. Marx wrote in a poem one time, "I wish to avenge myself against the one who rules above..." and he has certainly accomplished that. Because of Marx's doctrine of Communism, belief in God was outlawed, Bibles were outlawed, and millions of people have lost their lives in various countries around the world. On Judgment Day, Marx will be responsible for the lives and blood of millions of people. Marx, with his bitter hatred toward God, developed Communism.

Let's go on in the "Who's Who" in the evolutionary hall. We will continue in chronological order by their birthdates, because the tangled web becomes rather difficult to decipher. Each of these men were working with each other or near each other. Sometimes they were not aware of others working in the same field. Sometimes they were very close companions.

The next man we come to is Alfred Russell Wallace. He was born in 1823 and died in 1913. He was a contemporary with Darwin. He came up with several theories such as the survival of the fittest. This was used by the capitalists in the 1800's to justify the annihilation of

anyone who did not "fit in." For instance, Rockefeller, Carnegie, and some of those early tycoons, were ruthless in their business practices because they based their business practices on evolution. They said only the fittest can survive, so we will be the strongest and take over. With Rockefeller's Standard Oil company the way they used to monopolize the market was by buying out all of the stations in a particular town. Any stations that refused to sell were literally "driven out of business." For instance, if the price of gasoline was twenty cents a gallon, Rockefeller would instruct his people to sell it for fifteen cents a gallon for a few months, just long enough to put the competitor out of business. When the other station would go out of business, he would have a corner on the market and jack his prices back up. The idea of evolution actually had its modern beginning with Wallace. Darwin is given the credit for it, but Wallace actually published his book first, nearly a year earlier. He emphasized a struggle for existence, the survival of the fittest, and natural selection. Wallace had very little education. He served at an apprenticeship for a while. He read Thomas Payne's book, The Age of Reason, as a teenager and became very skeptical in matters of religion. He blended right in with ideas of socialism, Marxism, and anarchism. He was heavily influenced by Malthus' book, and he believed in spiritism and the occult. Wallace was a pantheist, whereas Darwin became more and more of an

atheist. They kind of split over the idea of whether there was really a God. Because of Wallace's spiritist, pantheist, and occultist teaching of evolution, he could really be considered the founding father of the New Age movement. He lived in Malaysia for about eight years, and watched the spiritist rituals that those people performed. He developed many of his theories in that setting. The New Age movement is nothing more than the old rebellion against God and the belief in evolution, with a little Hindu and Buddhist religion mixed in with it.

Let's continue our journey through the history of evolution. The next man we come to is Thomas Huxley. He was born in 1825 and died in 1895. Huxley was called "Darwin's bulldog." He actively promoted Darwin's work after his publication of Origin of Species. He was very strong in his beliefs, and anxious for Christianity to be overthrown. Thomas Huxley did not claim to be an atheist. He claimed to be an agnostic. He is the one that actually made up the term "agnostic." He said that if there is a God, it doesn't matter. God had no part in his life. He was an English biologist and a writer. He taught that ethics and morals had also evolved. He even wrote a book in the 1800's called Evolution and Ethics. He was very much a racist. Evolution lends itself readily to racism, which can be seen by the following quotes from Darwin and Huxley,

At some future period, not very distant as

measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes...will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian and the gorilla. (The Descent of Man, A. L. Burt Co., 1874, p. 178)

No rational man, cognizant of the facts, believes that the average negro is the equal, still less the superior, of the white man. And if this be true, it is simply incredible that, when all his disabilities are removed, and our prognathous relative has a fair field and no favor, as well as no oppressor, he will be able to compete successfully with his bigger-brained and smaller-jawed rival, in a contest which is to be carried on by thoughts and not by bites. (Lay Sermons, Addresses and Reviews, Appleton, 1871, p. 20)

Darwin's notion that the various races were at different evolutionary distances from the ape, with Negroes at the bottom and Caucasian at the top, was not unique to him, but rather was almost universal among the evolutionary scientists of the nineteenth century. Notice Huxley's argument that blacks could not compete intellectually with the Caucasians under equal and fair conditions. Racism started, or was greatly enhanced by Darwin and Thomas Huxley. Huxley is the grandfather of two men who were also famous in evolutionary circles today, Sir Julian Huxley and Aldous Huxley. Thomas Huxley had been witnessed to on several occasions. Here is one quote from the Encyclopedia of Illustrations, #6230, entitled "Huxley's Sunday Talk," by J. B. Dengis,

A friend of mine was once on a parliamentary commission with Prof. T. H. Huxley. They happened to stay at a little country inn over Sunday. Huxley said to my friend, "I suppose you are going to church this morning?" "I am; I always go to church." "I know you do," said Huxley, "but suppose this morning you sit down and talk with me about religion--simple experimental religion." "I will," said my friend, "if you mean it."

They sat down together, and my friend out of a deep and rich experience told him of the Cross of Christ and pardoning love, and after three hours tears stood in Huxley's eyes, and he put out his hand and said, "If only I could believe that, I would be willing to give my right hand." What do you call that but intellectual imprisonment?

The next individual on our journey through the history of evolution is Ernest Haeckel. He was born in 1834 and died in 1919. He was a German biologist and philosopher. He developed the "Biogenetic Law," or the "Recapitulation Theory." This theory teaches that the human embryo inside the mother's womb goes through the different stages of evolution, from fish to reptile to mammal to human. This has long since been disproven. It is now known that there is no recapitulation. This theory is used for the justification for abortion. The human embryo, the abortionists say, is not fully human yet and it is okay to kill it because it hasn't yet reached the human stage. I'm not saying that abortion started with evolution. I am saying that evolution does serve to give, in the abortionist's mind, some scientific justification to abortion.

Haeckel was a advocate of Lamarck's theory, that acquired characteristics could be inherited. He invented

all sorts of sketches or fabricated pictures that showed the different embryos of animals, including man, and how they were so similar. He later confessed that these were lies. These sketches were reproduced and are still displayed in some textbooks. Haeckel became one of Germany's ideologists for racism, nationalism, and imperialism. Probably more than any other man, Haeckel is responsible for the influence on a young man who was to come later and radically change the world, Adolf Hitler. In reading Haeckel's ideas and experiments, Hitler decided that the strongest race was the one that was to survive. His imperialism led to his belief that the Germans were to take over the world. Much harm as come to the world by this man, Ernest Haeckel.

In the mid 1850's, there was a revival of the Buddhist cult. It was co-founded by Colonel H. S. Olcott. The goal of this was to unify the Buddhist. The name of this revival was Theosophy. The Theosophy cult was also founded by Madam Helena Blavatsky. The second statement in their platform of doctrinal beliefs says, "The universe was evolved, not created, and it functions according to law." We are seeing a great revival of the New Age cult today.

Sigmund Freud is the next man in the great influence for evolution and against Biblical Christianity. He was born in 1856 and died in 1939. He was an ardent follower of Darwin. In 1915, he was convinced that Darwin's and Lamarck's theories were right. He believed

that acquired traits could be inherited. He thought that mental disorders were simply leftover behaviors that had been appropriate in earlier stages of evolution. He also believed in the Recapitulation Theory. Freud is known as the father of modern psychology. Many of the teachings and practices of psychology today are based on Freud's observations that man is just an animal and needs to be treated as an animal.

The next man we come to is Sir Julian Huxley. He was born in 1887 and died in 1975. He was the first Director General of UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). He was also one of the founders of the American Humanists Association in 1933. He was a pantheist and believed that nature is the god that is to be worshipped. He is quoted as saying, "Darwin's theory is no longer a theory, but a fact." He is also quoted as saying, "No supernatural designer is needed." He believed that evolution could answer all of the problems. He was a leader of the New Age Movement until his death in 1975. It is reported by his nurse that on his deathbed, as he looked up to heaven with a blank stare, he said, "So it is true."

His brother, Aldous Huxley, born in 1894, and died 1963, was a leader in the modern drug culture. He was an atheist, a philosopher, and a strong advocate of hallucinogenic drugs. Huxley is largely responsible for the drug culture that developed in the sixties. He was one

of the first intellectuals to openly promote taking drugs as a way to expand your mind and your experience.

There are number of people on the list in the twentieth century who have had an influence for evolution and against God. Henry Fairfield Osborne, an American anthropologist, was a leading evolutionist and an avid racist. During the first half of this century, he was the director of the American Museum of Natural History. He believed that the various stages of childhood for a Caucasian were said to represent the lower races and how high they had attained in evolution. For instance, he said that the blacks are at the bottom, then the yellow races, then the whites are at the top. Let me quote from Osborne's book, The Evolution of Human Races, Natural History magazine, Jan/Feb 1926, p. 129, "

The Negroid stock is even more ancient than the Caucasian and Mongolian, as may be proved by an examination not only of the brain, of the hair, of the bodily characters, such as the teeth, the genitalia, the sense organs, but of the instincts, the intelligence. The standard of intelligence of the average adult Negro is similar to that of the eleven-year-old youth of the species Homo sapiens.

Evolution has brought the world so much trouble. This is one of the key tools that Satan is using here in the end times to bring the world under his dominion. Shintoism is the state religion of Japan. It is a mixture of Buddhism and ancient polytheistic myths about Japanese people. Shintoism teaches that the Japanese are

descendants of the gods and are destined to rule the world. They teach that the Emperor is from the sun god, the highest god. It was Shintoism, based on evolution, that was responsible for Japan's actions in World War II. They were determined to take over and rule the world, just like Hitler was doing in Germany. Both of them were motivated by a desire to help evolution along. This goes right back to the Garden of Eden where Satan said, "Ye shall be as gods." From the very beginning, man has had a desire to take over the throne of God and Satan promotes that desire by the teaching of evolution.

THE RELIGION OF EVOLUTION

It has long been my contention that evolution is just another religion. There is no empirical evidence to back it up so it is certainly not a part of science. The evolutionists say that man made God instead of God making man. Who is right? In this chapter I would like to discuss the evolution of religion or the religion of evolution, which is it? The public schools have been teaching for the last fifty years that religion has evolved. We have been taught that man started off believing in many gods, worshiping the rocks, stars, etc, the cave man philosophy, and that he gradually developed monotheism (the belief in one God). Yet archaeology seems to tell us that just the opposite is true. It tells us that man has always been a monotheist and worshipped one God. All of the ancient cultures seem to teach us just the opposite of what we are being taught in our public schools today.

Religion has not evolved. Man did not create God; God created man. Since evolution is just a religion, it should not be taught in public schools at taxpayers expense unless all religions are going to be taught.

In 1963, the Supreme Court ruled that if a parent or child objects to certain materials being taught in the public schools, the child cannot be removed from the class because that would violate his constitutional rights. The

court further decided that the objectionable course or material would have to be removed. This case involved the question of prayer and religion. The precedent can be applied to sex education or any other questionable material. The ruling also said that no government building or facility may be used to commit inhibitions or hostilities to godly religion. There may some reading this who may remember when prayer when was taken out of the public school system. I was only in the fifth grade and did not understand what was going on. Madeline Murray O'Hare did not want her son made to pray in the public school. She said that it was objectionable to her. She claimed that that was an obvious case of the government advancing a religion at the taxpayers expense. She was very successful in getting prayer taken out of the public school system.

Of course, I don't like what Madeline Murray O'Hare stands for or what she did, but it does bring up an interesting point. If evolution is just a religion, then it also should be taken out of the public schools. I would like to see some legal action taken to get evolution taken out of the public school system on the grounds that it is just a religion. The first step is to approach the school board and request that they remove the objectionable materials. Step two is to go to the people who supply the funds for the school, the county commission. Step three is to take the issue to court.

There are basically four options in this issue.

The first option is to teach evolution only and ignore creation or any other theories of the origin of the earth. This is what is going on now in the public school system. The option at the other end of the scale would be to teach only creation. This is what was going on in 1925 in Dayton, Tennessee. Tennessee had passed a law that made the teaching of evolution a crime. A young biology teacher in the small town of Dayton was encouraged to create a test case by teaching evolution in spite of the law. The teacher was arrested and tried. The now famous atheist lawyer Clarence Darrow came in as defense for the side of the teacher and evolution. Darrow said that it was unfair to teach only one side of the issue. He said that it was the height of bigotry to prevent students from learning both sides of this issue. Even though Darrow lost the case and the teacher was fined \$100, his plea for equal treatment was headed. Slowly the schools began to teach the theory of evolution with the truth of creation.

We are now at the other end of the spectrum. The tides have totally shifted and we are now teaching only evolution. This is Scopes in reverse. The same bigotry that they objected against they now condone since the tales are turned. Even though they can, most public school teachers don't mention creation. They have been told that it is against the law to talk about creation because it is a religious subject. Evolution is religious also.

There are two middle-ground options available in

this issue. The first would be to teach both evolution and creation in the public school classrooms. This was passed as law in the state of Louisiana, but was never enforced because people contested that law. This was contested because the idea of creation has religious connotations and therefore, they contested, it should not be taught in the public school system. They immediately claim the "separation of church and state." This ideal is not found in the Constitution. It is found in Jefferson's writings. Even if this true, the courts decided that teachers have the right to give any number of theories on the origin of the earth.

The next option is to leave both of these beliefs out of the public school system. I taught high school science and mathematics. I know that you can teach students many things without mentioning origins and where we came from. It is possible to leave the issue totally up to the home or to the church.

The public school system is right now using option number one, teaching dogmatically evolution. They would never dream of switching to option four of teaching only creation. Since option two of teaching both has not worked, I believe we are left with option three. I believe we should just leave both beliefs out of the public school system. Madeline Murray O'Hare had a very valid point. It is not right to use tax dollars to promote religion, any religion, in the public school system.

Webster defines a religion as "a belief in a divine or super-human power or powers to be obeyed and worshipped as the creator of the universe." What created the universe? Was it blind chance, evolution? If so, then blind chance is their creator and they worship chance. Time and matter become the gods of the evolutionist. If you begin taking away time from the evolutionist by saying that the earth is young, that is like taking a pacifier out of a baby's mouth. If Webster's definition of religion is correct, then evolution is definitely a part of religion, not science. I taught science for many years, and I am not against real science. However, we have entered the realm of religion when we begin saying that the earth came into being out of nothing.

There is a wealth of information on this subject. Let me share what a few evolutionists have said about evolution. Sir Arthur Keith, an avid evolutionist, said, "Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it because the only alternative is special creation and that is unthinkable." This reveals quite a bit about the evolutionists. They believe it only because they do not like the option of special creation. L. H. Matthews, the evolutionist who wrote the preface to the 1971 edition of Darwin's book, said, "Belief in the theory of evolution was exactly parallel to the belief in special creation with evolution merely a satisfactory faith on which to base our interpretation of nature." Evolution is a faith, a

religion. Pierre Grasse, the French biologist, said, "Scientists should destroy the myth of evolution." L. H. Lipsome, the British physicist said, "In fact, evolution in a sense became a scientific religion. Almost all scientists have accepted it and many are prepared to bend their observations to fit in with it."

Evolution without a question is a religion. It is a religion of humanism. Either man is the ultimate king of the world, or God is the ultimate king of the world. Humanism is the religion of man being the ultimate. Humanist Manifesto One says, "Humanism is a philosophical, religious, and moral point of view as old as human civilization itself." They admit right up front that it is religious. They go on to say, "In 1933 a group of 34 liberal humanists enunciated the philosophical and religious principles that seemed to them fundamental. They drafted Humanist Manifesto One, which for it's time was a radical document. This document was concerned with expressing a general religious and philosophical outlook that rejected Orthodox and dogmatic positions and provided meaning and direction, unity and purpose to human life. It was committed to reason, science, and democracy." It goes on to say that "if no deity will save us, we must save ourselves." Humanism without a question is religious. Humanists admit to this fact. Here are a few different statements from Humanist Manifesto I & II that further illustrate the religious nature of evolutionism: (the

numbers correspond to the actual statement number from Humanist Manifesto I and II by Prometheus Books edited by Paul Kurtz.) The first statement is "religious humanists regard the universe as self-existing, not created." They are calling themselves "religious humanists." Humanism is a religion. Here in the foundational document of humanism, we see that they regard the universe as self-existing and not created. In other words, they believe in evolution. Matter has always been here and the earth created itself. The second statement is "humanism believes that man is a part of nature and that he has emerged as a result of a continuous process." Again referring plainly to evolution. It could be easily proven that the foundation of humanism is evolution and humanism is a religion. Therefore, the teaching of evolution in the tax-supported public school system is the fostering and furthering of a religion. The only religion being promoted at the taxpayers expense is the religion of humanism. We need to put a stop to that. The third statement in the Humanist Manifesto says "holding an organic view of life, humanists find that traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected." With the phrase "an organic view of life", they are saying that evolution is the way we got here. The fourth statement says, "We are products of a gradual development." "Gradual development" again refers to evolution. The eighth statement in the Humanist Manifesto says "Religious humanism considers the complete realization of human

personality to be the end of man's life and seeks its development and fulfillment in the here and now." Again, they refer to their philosophy as "religious humanism." The ninth statement says, "In place of the old attitudes involved in worship and prayer, the humanist finds his emotions expressed in a heightened sense of personal life in a cooperative effort to promote social well-being." The twelfth statement says, "Religious humanists aim to foster the creative in man and encourage achievements that add to the satisfactions of life." The thirteenth statement begins "Religious humanism maintains that all associations and institutions exist for the fulfillment of human life." The last paragraph of Humanists Manifesto One says "So stand the theses of religious humanism." That is the gist of the Humanist Manifesto.

We go on now to the Humanist Manifesto Two written by Paul Kurtz and Edwin Wilson. It says "salvationism still appears as harmful." Read this carefully. The idea here is to teach people that Christians are the enemy and that we are standing in the way of progress. I believe we as Christians need to be aware of this message. Most of the programs on television are examples of Hollywood's definite desire to discredit Christianity. You will not see a preacher portrayed as a God-fearing man. You will see him portrayed as a wild-eyed fanatic killing people, or stealing money from the church or some other evil deed. You will never see the truth in the Hollywood movies about

Christianity. There is a deliberate war being waged against religion in general and Christianity in particular. Other religions such as Hinduism and Buddhism are taught as being okay, even in the public schools. But the idea of bringing in Christianity is utterly despised.

The Humanist Manifesto Two goes on to say "any account of nature should pass the test of scientific evidence. In our judgment, the dogmas and myths of traditional religion do not do so." If they really mean that "the account of nature should pass the test of scientific evidence", they should examine and see if evolution will pass the test of scientific evidence. In order for something to be scientific, it has to be observable. Anything outside the realm of observation is not scientific. For something to be scientific, it must be testable. There is no observation to back up evolution and no test has devised to demonstrate it. If evolution occurred in the past, it should have been preserved for us in the fossil record. We have trillion of fossils, yet we have absolutely no evidence of evolution occurring in the past. There is nothing going on in the present that gives evidence of evolution.

Stephen J. Gould and Nyles Eldredge, two famous evolutionists, said, "At the higher level of evolutionary transition between basic morphological designs, gradualism has always been in trouble though it remains the official position of most western evolutionists. Smooth

intermediates between basic kinds are almost impossible to construct. Even in thought experiments, there is certainly no evidences for them in the fossil record. Curious mosaics like archaeopteryx do not count." In his review of Steven Stanley's book Macro-Evolution, D. S. Woodruff said, "Fossil species remain unchanged throughout most of their history and the record fails to record a single example of a transition." There is no evidence in the fossil record for evolution. In a Newsweek article entitled "Is Man a Subtle Accident?", November 3, 1980, it is said, "The missing link between man and ape, whose absence has comforted fundamentalist since the days of Darwin, is merely the most glamorous of a whole hierarchy of phantom creatures. The more scientists have searched for the transitional forms that lie between species, the more they have been frustrated." There have been no missing links. The entire chain is missing!

Evolution is a religion. It does not fit the criteria of science. It is not observable. There is no observation for evolution in the past or in the present. Stephen J. Gould says in Natural History The Return of Hopeful Monsters, "The fossil record with its abrupt transitions offers no support for gradual change. All paleontologists know that the fossil record contains precious little in the way of intermediate forms. Transitions between major groups are characteristically abrupt." If the definition of science is observation,

classification of data, and experimentation, where is the observation for evolution? Evolution is a religious faith. If the evolutionists want to believe in evolution, they are free to do so. We live in America which is a free country. We are free to choose what we want to believe. What I am upset about is the fact that their faith is being taught as science in the public school system at my expense as a taxpayer. That upsets me greatly!

Romans 1:21 says, "Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened, Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, And changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to bird, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, and to dishonor their own bodies between themselves. Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections; for even their women did change the natural use into that which is again nature. And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was meet. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge..."

This last statement says it all. Evolution is a deliberate attempt to eliminate God. It is time for thinking people to dethrone evolution and get some common sense back in the science class.

I write letters to the editor very frequently. Here is one published some time ago that sums up my

feelings on the subject.

Evolution isn't science

Remember the story of tailors who kept asking for more silk and gold to make a royal suit for the king? The deceitful men were pocketing the goods and giving the king imaginary clothes. Anyone who couldn't "see" the splendor of these "clothes" was obviously not intelligent.

To even dare to suggest that His Highness was not gorgeously arrayed was to invite a barrage of ridicule and scorn. And so the entire kingdom was duped into silence until a small "ignorant" boy cried out, "The king hath no clothes!"

It is still true today that a few scoundrels can cajole the masses into silence about the obvious using ridicule and derision. For example: It is obvious that evolution didn't, doesn't and won't happen. Design demands a designer. Frogs don't turn into princes, and "bib bangs" make big messes not neat, orderly universes. There are no facts to support evolutionism. It stands royally naked.

Over 90 percent of the "ignorant" masses believe that the world was created by God. Thousands of taxpayers in this county resent their tax money supporting the humanist religion of evolution in our schools. In spite of this, Katie Knight (science curriculum supervisor in Escambia County) told me that only one person is objecting to the teaching of evolution in our schools...Me.

How long will we let them steal our gold and give us nothing in return? They steal our kids' class time and brain power promoting this fairy tale of evolution while they keep asking for more gold.

Review the books this year, and voice your complaint. Textbooks are being selected now. Let's get back to teaching real science and stop letting them tell us that evolutionism must be included.

It is not science and is not even remotely related to science., Even though the socialist tailors insist I'm the one who is blind and give evolutionism royal treatment, I still say, "The king (evolution) hath no clothes!"

THE EFFECTS OF EVOLUTION

Evolution is probably one of the most important subjects facing us today because of the world view and lifestyle that it breeds. A person's belief that he is a creation of God involves a particular world view that will make him live a certain way. If he believes that he is a creation of chance, that there is no God, then that will produce a lifestyle or world view that will have certain consequences on his life.

Who cares anyway? Why is this subject so important?

I'd like to begin by saying that the subject is very dear to my heart. I'm both glad and sad to be able to discuss the topic of creation/evolution in the Bible. I'm glad because I love the Bible and the God of the Bible and I'm honored to be able to share my faith in God's incredible book. I'm glad because we have freedom in this country that allows us to discuss topics like this. Many other countries do not even allow a discussion on this subject. You have to accept the state opinion. America is headed that way, I fear. But I'm glad that right now in America we have the freedom to discuss the contradictory or conflicting religions of creation and evolution. I'm glad because discussions of this type will force people to take a stand on the issue. You either believe one side or the other. There is no middle ground in this case.

But I am very sad because many other countries don't allow this type of discussion on creation and evolution. Many millions of my brothers in the faith have given their lives and fortunes for the Blessed Book, the Bible. I'm sad because it looks like many more will have to do the same in the next few years, the way things are going. I'm also sad because those who reject the words of this Blessed Book are missing the greatest joy known to man, fellowship with God. They are also missing the real reason and purpose of life. If the words of the time-tested Book are true, those who reject them and the forgiveness they offer are doomed to face God and give an account of their sin before their Creator. God will be their Judge, on that day, whereas He will be my Father on that day. This topic is personal for me; it's not just academic. If someone says that the Bible is a myth and is not true, or that the doctrine of evolution is true, and the Genesis account of creation is false, they are attacking the very foundation of my faith. Jesus said that the creation of Adam and Eve was "the beginning." (Matt. 19:4) It would be like saying that my Father is a liar. Calling Genesis a myth, or creation a myth is like saying slanderous things about my mom or dad or wife or family. It will be hard for me not to get emotionally involved in this topic.

We need to remember Aristotle's dictum. Aristotle said

If a document is being questioned, the benefit of the doubt is given to the document itself, not arrogated by the critic to himself. One must listen to the claims of the document under analysis and not assume fraud or error unless the author disqualifies himself by contradictions or known factual inerrancies.

There are basically two choices in this argument. Choice number one is that the material universe that we see made itself out of nothing for no reason. Then, through a long process of evolution the different animals and man developed as we see them today.

Choice number two is that there is an infinite, all-powerful, all-wise God who created this universe that we see for some special reasons. There are those who try to make a middle ground position called theistic-evolution. This says that God created the matter and helped evolution along at critical points like the origin of life and things like that. That is an indefensible position.

The choices are either the universe made itself or God made it. Both are in the realm of religion. People that believe in evolution want to make you think that what they believe is a scientific fact. Nothing could be farther from the truth. These people are either extremely optimistic or just bold-faced liars. Evolution is not a scientific fact. It actually is not even a good theory. It is just a hypothesis.

Actually, evolution fits into the realm of religion. Webster's definition of religion says "belief in

a divine or super-human power to be obeyed and worshiped as the creator and ruler of the universe." If this process of evolution created and rules the universe, then that is the super-human power that the evolutionists worship. Many people down through the years have admitted that evolution is just a religion. Some still won't today because they don't understand the subject. For instance, Sir Arthur Keith, the British biologist, said "Evolution is unproved and unprovable. We believe it because the only alternative is special creation, and that is unthinkable." L. H. Matthews, the man who wrote the preface to the 1971 edition of Charles Darwin's book, The Origin of Species, said, "The belief in the theory of evolution was exactly parallel to belief in special creation, with evolution merely a satisfactory faith on which to base our interpretation of nature." It is a faith. Pierre Grasse, a French biologist, said, "Scientists should destroy the myth of evolution." The British physicist, L. H. Lipsome, said, "In fact, evolution became in a sense, a scientific religion. Almost all scientists have accepted it, and many are prepared to bend their observations to fit in with it." Evolutionists can rant and rave all they want and say that evolution is a proven fact, when actually there is not one bit of scientific evidence to back up macro-evolution. By that I mean major changes between kinds of animals.

Micro-evolution is small little changes where there is no change from one kind of organism to another.

Actually, evolution would be a bad term to use. Micro-evolution is only variations within the kind. It proves foresight of the Creator in providing His creatures with the ability to adapt--within limits--to their environment. I don't question that variation exists, I just interpret the evidence as part of God's design.

I'll give you just one example to help you understand the difference. Let's suppose we let loose five hundred canaries on an island. The only food for the canaries to eat on that island are nuts with a relatively tough shell around them. Only the canaries that had a tough beak would be able to eat the nuts and survive. The others would starve to death. Therefore, those that had the tougher beaks would be able to reproduce the next generation. If we came back to that island in about two hundred years, we would find that all of the canaries on the island have tough beaks. That is not evolution. That is simply variation. You would still have canaries. The trait of having a tough beak was in the genetic structure to begin with. Nothing new has been added. We have only selected a certain portion of the population to survive. That is variation, not evolution. Those canaries will never, given all the time you want, will never change into elephants, or dinosaurs, or trees, or tomatoes. If they did, that would be macro-evolution. Micro-evolution is small little variations between the species that have been

in the genetic structure by. It has nothing whatsoever to do with the terms that are used today about evolution.

Let me quote just a few more things here. In Scientific America, May, 1984, Allen Goode said,

The inflationary model of the universe provides a possible mechanism by which the observable universe could have evolved from an infinitesimal region. It is then tempting to go one step further and speculate that the entire universe evolved from literally nothing.

You can "speculate" and say that it's possible all you want, but that is a religion. That's your faith. Don't tell me that is science. You cannot prove that. If you want to believe that, that is fine. This is America. You can believe whatever you want to believe, but don't tell me that is science, and don't use my tax dollars to teach other kids in the public schools that that is science. That's nonsense. If you think that it is really important to teach evolution to the young people, then go start yourself a private school, charge tuition, and teach evolution to those who want to pay to come and learn it. But it is deceitful, wrong, and wicked to use the public's tax money to promote this religion of evolution in our public schools. We've got to put a stop to it.

Let me quote just a few more here. David Kits, in "Paleontology and Evolutionary Thought" magazine, said, "Evolution, at least in the sense that Darwin speaks of it, cannot be detected within the life time of a single observer." It cannot be detected. It is not part of

science. It is just a religion. Here is a quote from Myer's book Systematic and Origin of Species, "Darwin never really did discuss the origin of species in his On the Origin of Species". Collin Patterson, the curator at the British museum of natural history said, "No one has ever produced a species by mechanisms of natural selection. No one has gotten near it."

The mechanisms for evolution that they try to tell us works so well are mutations and natural selection. No one has ever produced a new species by those means. Evolution is a religion. If evolutionists want to believe it, that is fine. But that is just their faith. I want to believe that God created it and that is my faith, and I readily admit it.

Many say "We can't mix religion and the public schools." In the first place, that is a faulty argument. The public schools desperately need some religion. They were started by religious institutions. There is nothing wrong with putting our religion in the public schools.

The second argument that many people say is "Well, you can't mix church and state." That is not found anywhere in the constitution. That is in Jefferson's writings, "The Separation of Church and State." The constitution says that the government can make no law respecting an establishment of a religion or hindering the free exercise thereof. Teaching our young people that we evolved from monkeys in hindering the religion of

Christianity. It's causing them to doubt their faith, and it needs to be eliminated. The first amendment goes against the teaching of evolution. It is a hindrance to religious activity. Evolution is just a religion. We must establish early in the discussion that the creation/evolution question cannot be scientifically resolved because both are religious faiths. They are dogmas. They are what you believe.

People come in to this argument having already decided what they want to believe based on their lifestyle. If a person has a wicked lifestyle and wants to get rid of God some how, then it is only natural that he would choose the evolutionary idea to try to leave God out.

By way of giving just a little more fact that evolution is just a religion, and not scientific, Steven J. Gould, a noted evolutionist, said in

The fossil record with its abrupt transitions, offers no support for gradual change. All paleontologists know that the fossil record contains precious little in the way of intermediate forms. Transitions between major groups are characteristically abrupt. (KJV: GET BOOK TITLE)

Evolution is their faith; they believe it because that is what they want to believe. In Newsweek magazine, "Is Man a Subtle Accident?", (Nov. 3, 1980),

The missing link between man and ape, whose absence has comforted fundamentalists since the days of Darwin, is merely the most glamorous of a whole hierarchy of phantom creatures. The more scientists have searched for the transitional forms that lie between species, the more they have been frustrated.

There are no transitional forms between species because that is not the way we got here. Gould and Eldridge in Paleobiography (KJV; GET TITLE), said,

At the higher level of evolutionary transition between basic morphological design, gradualism has always been in trouble. Though it remains the official position of most western evolutionists, smooth intermissions between different animals are almost impossible to construct. Even in thought experiments, there is certainly no evidence for them in the fossil record. Curious mosaics like Archaeopteryx do not count.

In his review of Steven Stanley's book Macro-evolution D. S. Woodruff, said, "Fossil species remain unchanged throughout most of their history and the record fails to contain a single example of a significant transition." There aren't any examples.

Don't fall for the statement that evolution is a proven fact. It is absolutely not. It is their religion versus my religion. I will quickly admit that what I have is a faith. I cannot prove creation and you cannot prove evolution. If we approach it on the common ground that both ideas are religious, it will make a lot more sense. It is not science versus religion. Don't let them use that phrase when they talk about the controversy of creation versus evolution. It is not science versus religion; it is religion versus religion. Both of them are simply religious beliefs.

The effect of these religious beliefs has always

been of interest to me. If we teach our kids in public schools that they are merely animals, then they will act like animals. We should not be surprised. If we teach kids in school that they are a creation of God, that God is their creator, and will some day be their judge, we can expect their behavior to be different because of their basic philosophy.

The teaching of evolution is important because, number one, it affects our society. Many people down through history in the name of evolution, have had some dramatic effects on our society. Adolf Hitler, for instance, was an avid evolutionist. In order to comprehend Hitler's reasoning, one must go back to evolution to understand why he did the things that he did, and thought the way he thought. Hitler slaughtered the Jews and hated the blacks because he was an evolutionist. He thought it was his duty to aid evolution in improving the human race. He taught and believed that each of the different races in the world were actually different species of man, and that it was the job of the superior species (Germany) to annihilate the inferior species. In the name of evolution, Hitler closed down the Christian schools in Germany in the early 1930's. He began indoctrinating the people heavily with the idea of the "German superior race", saying the because of evolution they had evolved further and it was their duty to rule the world.

Let me give you a quote here. Sir Arthur Keith, in

his book Evolution and Ethics, (1947), page 10, said,

The leader of Germany is an evolutionist, not only in theory, but as millions know to their costs, in the rigor of its practice. For him, the national "front" of Europe is only the evolutionary "front;" he regards himself, and is regarded, as the incarnation of the will of Germany, the purpose of that will being to guide the evolutionary destiny of its people.

Hitler was an evolutionist and it was the crazy doctrine of evolution that is fundamentally responsible for World War II.

In Japan, the same thing was going on with the Shintu religion. This teaches that the Japanese people evolved from gods and it was their destiny to rule the world. Japan and Germany got together and we had an awful time in World War II.

Yes, the controversy and debate of evolution and creation has a tremendous influence on our society.

Joseph Stalin was another evolutionist. I quote here from the Impact article, published by the Institute for Creation Research in El Cajon, California, October, 1987, Impact Article #172, entitled "Stalin's Brutal Faith."

One of the men that had a profound impact on Joseph Stalin when he was just a young person was the man Charles Darwin and his book The Origin of Species. At a very early age, while still a pupil in the ecclesiastical school, Comrade Stalin developed a critical mind and revolutionary sentiments. He began to read Darwin and became an atheist.

G. Glurdjidze, a friend of Stalin's relates, "I began to speak of God. Joseph heard me out, and after a moment of silence, he said, "You know, they are fooling us. There is no god."

I was astonished at these words. I had never heard anything like it before.'

"How can you say such things so-so!" I exclaimed.

"I'll lend you a book to read; it will show you that the world and all living things are quite different from what you imagined, and you will see that all of this talk about God is sheer nonsense,' Joseph said.

'What book is that?' I enquired.

'Darwin. You must read it,' Joseph impressed on me.

A few pages later, another individual was reflecting on Stalin's youthful pursuits, and he added the following,

...In order to disabuse the minds of our seminary students of the myth that the world was created in six days, we had to acquaint ourselves with the geological origin and the age of the earth and be able to prove them in argument. We had to familiarize ourselves with Darwin's writings.

Joseph Stalin, in the name of evolution and to help purify the Russian race, was responsible for killing sixty million of his own people during his reign of terror. We are still digging up mass graves of people that were slaughtered by Stalin.

Communism also has its roots in evolution. Let me quote some more here from the Impact Article, 172, "Stalin's Brutal Faith," "As early as December 12, 1859, only two months after the Origin of Species was published, Frederick Engles wrote to Karl Marx, "Darwin, whom I am

just now reading, is splendid." About a year later, December 19, 1860, Karl Marx, the father of communism responded, "During my time of trial these last few weeks, I have read all sorts of things, among others, Darwin's book of natural selection. Although it is developed in the crude English style, this is the book which contains the basis in natural history for our view." To one Ferdinand LaSalle, he wrote on January 16, 1861, "Darwin's book is very important and serves me as the basis in natural science for the class struggle in history." Zirkle that Marx wanted to dedicate "Das Capital" to Darwin. Harvard's Stephen J. Gould, an intense and modern spokesman for evolution, corroborates that he saw Darwin's copy of Marx's first copy inscribed by Marx, describing himself as a sincere admirer of the English naturalist, Darwin. Someone credits Vladimar Lenin with the following commentary on Darwin, "Darwin put an end to the belief that the animal/vegetable species bare no relation to one another except by chance and that they were created by God and are hence immutable." Communism has its roots in evolution.

The effects that evolution has had on our society, just with the three that I've mentioned here, Hitler, Stalin, and Communism, are incredible. The human lives that have been lost cannot be calculated. Nor can the money that has been spent fighting communism and Nazism be calculated. It staggers the imagination to think of the effects that evolution has had on our society. Creation

versus evolution is an extremely important discussion and debate. We are setting the trap for young people by teaching them evolution in school. We are destroying our own future by presenting this ridiculous doctrine as a scientific fact. The effect on society alone is tremendous.

The philosophy of origins that a person chooses also has an effect on many other decisions he or she makes. The people that are divided on whether they believe that abortion is right or wrong are generally divided into the same groups that form over the issue of creation and evolution. If a person believes that we are a creation of God, then of course, abortion is wrong. If a person believes that evolution is true, that we just evolved with blind chance, then abortion would be fine. The abortion issue really needs to be argued on creation/evolution ground first. The same could be said for many other issues of life like euthanasia, drugs, teen sex, homosexuality, etc.

Secondly, I think evolution not only affects our society, it affects our modern science. One of the things that we try to teach students is what is called the "scientific method." There are basically four steps involved in the scientific method. There are basically four steps in the scientific method: observation, experimentation, classification of data, and conclusion. It is extremely important that scientists learn to use the

"scientific method," particularly observation and experimentation. They need to learn how to be good scientists.

We take our science classes and try to teach them the unobservable thing of evolution. Evolution has never been observed in the present; it has never been observed in the past. There is no record in the fossil record for evolution. There is no observation for this doctrine and it does not belong in science. It is part of a religion. There is no experimentation for evolution. Do an experiment, show me evolution happening. All they have been able to show so far are genetic changes that have been neutral or negative. There has never been an increase in genetic matter or genetic structure.

We have developed, for instance, through the fruit fly experiment, that went for many years, flies with no eyes, flies with red eyes, flies with rumpled wings, flies with no wings, but never anything but another fly. It was always a fly that was less likely to survive in the wild. How well could a fly that couldn't fly survive?

Evolution teaches that things gradually increase, and yet there is no experimentation to back it up. No one has ever done one experiment to prove any phase of macro-evolution at all.

The effect that evolution has on science, I think is devastating. America is rapidly losing ground in the world market in our science students. We are turning out

students that many other countries are able to beat in academic scores and academic knowledge because we waste so much class time and textbook time on this dumb idea of evolution. It cannot be proved. There is no observation. There is no experimentation. It does not belong in the science classroom. It has a tremendous effect on our scientific program. It hinders right thinking. We teach students, "Hey, you are going to be a scientist. Now only believe what you can observe." But yet we teach them evolution, which we cannot observe. That is absurd. We waste a tremendous amount of money trying to prove evolution.

On the trip to the moon, they were so concerned that there might be some type of bacteria life on the moon. They spent extra money to isolate the moon-rocks when they got them in the spacecraft, and when they got them back on earth. They will do the same with all the other planets. They will say, "Oh, there might be life there. We need to protect those rocks." One of the astronauts offered to eat some of the moon dust on the way back to prove that there was no life on it and that it was perfectly sterile. Bring back a Mars rock or a Jupiter rock, I'll eat it or lick it. There is no life on the other planet. Life doesn't evolve. There is no evidence for evolution and it wastes a lot of our money because they've got the wrong thinking. They thought the moon was millions of years old, so they put giant landing pads on the spacecraft. They wasted a lot of

money because they thought the cosmic dust would be so deep on the moon. The cosmic dust layer indicated that the moon was only six or seven thousand years old. We will discuss this in further detail later in the book.

Christians need to stand up for what is right. I believe God's Word is the truth, and all real scientific evidence validates it.

TIME--WHAT IS IT AND HOW OLD IS THE EARTH?

Believe it or not, one of the most important subjects that needs to be addressed in the creation-evolution controversy is the subject of time. How old is the earth? Is the earth and universe six or seven thousand years old as the Bible seems to indicate, or is it billions of years old as the evolutionists claim? If the earth is not old, if it is only six or seven thousand years old, as I contend that it is, that ends the argument for evolution. There can be no evolution in such a short time frame. Time is absolutely essential to the evolutionists. If a person starts trying to prove the fact that the earth is only six or seven thousand years old, the evolutionists get extremely defensive. They will bring up many different questions such as: What about carbon dating? What about the dinosaurs? What about cave men? What about the geologic features of the earth, etc. I will try to answer these questions as well as many others later in this book.

First we will look at the subject of time. Lack of billions of years is the Achilles' heel to evolution. If there isn't a lot of time, the argument is absolutely over. Time is essential to the evolutionist. Their entire argument is built on the premise that there is plenty of time.

How old is the earth? First of all, let's discuss "What is time anyway?" Time is a measurement that we use

as humans here on earth to measure the rate at which things decay. Time is a human element that does not affect God. It's difficult for us to understand how there can be no time in heaven. How can there be another dimension? We tend to think that this is April 28, 1990 (or whatever date it is) in heaven. This is the most common mistake people make when thinking about God. God is not limited by time. There is no time at all in heaven. God is the same yesterday, today, and forever because He is in a different dimension than we are. Right away someone will say, "Now that just doesn't make sense. Everything is affected by time." Be careful with statements like that. You are trying to put human limitations on God. God does not have any human limitations. We are the ones locked in time and space, not God. Heaven and eternity are not things we can comprehend while we are locked in flesh. An example of this would be the story where Paul was stoned to death outside the city of Lystra. Paul went to heaven where he got a foretaste of eternity. He saw Heaven!!! God said, "I'm sorry, Paul, you must go back down to earth. I'm not done with you yet." So, Paul went back down as they were dragging his body out of the city to throw it on the garbage heap. He crawled into that body again and arose from the dead. He said fourteen years later, "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven." (II

Cor. 12:2) He said that there he saw things that were not lawful for him to utter. I believe what happened there was that he saw things that he could not describe to his listening audience because they were still bound in their human bodies. If you were talking to a blind man and you were going to try to explain to him the different colors of the rainbow, you would be wasting your time. He cannot understand the differences. You cannot explain sounds or music to a person who has been deaf all of his life. You just won't get the information into his mind. There are five entrances into the human mind. We call those the five senses. We think that God is limited to those five. There may be thousands or millions of things beyond our comprehension. To say that it is 1990 in heaven is to put human limitations on God. I think that is a very foolish thing to do.

What time is it in heaven? Let's imagine that you are in a helicopter above the Grand Canyon. As you hover up there, (we'll imagine that you have the capacity to hover for days and days at a time), you notice through your telescope that some people are launching a raft at beginning of the canyon. About thirty minutes later, another group of people launch a raft. Thirty minutes later, a third group of people launch a raft. Every thirty minutes a new group of people starts their journey through the Grand Canyon on a raft. None of the groups can see each other because of the twists and bends of the river as


it goes through the Canyon. They cannot see the group in front of them or behind them. As far as they are concerned, they're all alone. However, you, in your helicopter, are able to see all of the groups at the same time. You can see the one at the beginning of the race that left four days ago, and you can see the group that is just now leaving.

Each one of the groups has a different perspective of the canyon. Each one of them sees a different section of the canyon. They are locked into position. They cannot decide to jump ahead fifty miles or to jump back fifty miles. They have to go with the flow, so to speak. You are in the same position here on earth as far as time goes. We are locked into 1991 right now. We will be here for a year, then we will be locked into 1992. We cannot speed it up or slow it down regardless of what we do. However, God is not in our time with us. He is above time. God is the one in the helicopter, so to speak. He can see the beginning and the end and the middle all simultaneously. That is absolutely beyond our comprehension. We don't understand that at all, but by faith we have to believe that because God revealed Himself to us as being outside of time. He is omniscient, knows all things. He is omnipresent, present everywhere and at all times. God could right now from His vantage point in heaven, see Adam and Eve in the garden. He could see the end of the world, or see Christ on the cross, or any of the

historical events between this roughly six thousand year history of the earth. To say that God is locked into time is a serious mistake that people need to avoid.

Someone once asked me the question, "What did God do for all of those billions of years before He made the earth?" That question indicates the faulty logic that God is locked into time like we are. You must avoid that if you are to understand anything about God. God created time. He started it about six thousand years ago and will let it run until He is finished with whatever it is He wants to do. When we get to heaven, there will be no time.

We will not be in heaven for billions of years. There will not be any years at all. There are many songs that allude to time in heaven. For instance, "When we've been there ten thousand years." I'm sorry, but we will not be there for ten thousand years. We will be there forever, which is a totally new dimension. I cannot explain it, because I don't understand it. I just have to believe it. I do know that it says in I Corinthians 2:9 that God has things that we are not capable of understanding, things that are beyond our comprehension. There are new things for us to learn. Right now we are not able to understand what heaven is like because of our limitations.



For instance, look at the illustration of the electromagnetic spectrum. The section that we can see with our eyes we call the "color range." These are basically six colors of the rainbow: red, orange, yellow, green, blue, and violet. The spectrum goes beyond that in both directions forever. On the red side of the scale it goes down to infrared. You and I cannot see infrared with our eyes. That does not mean that it doesn't exist. It just means that we cannot see it. The spectrum goes beyond violet to ultraviolet. We cannot see ultraviolet. We have a limited receptor, our eye. It is able to pick up just this brief range of colors from red to violet. Suppose that God decided to give us eyes that would be able to see the entire magnetic spectrum. We could then see radio waves, radar, television, or microwaves. I don't mean pick them up with an instrument. I mean actually see them with our eye. I don't know if that is going to happen or not, but it could be that in heaven there will be brand new colors. I don't mean brand new shades or combinations of these colors that we are used to. I mean brand new colors. If I went to heaven for five minutes and saw brand new colors, and came back down to earth, and you said "Kent, where have you been?" I would say, "Well, I've been to heaven for five minutes." You would say, "What's it like?" I would say, "I can't explain it to you." You would think something was wrong, just like I'm sure people thought Paul was crazy after he came back down from heaven and said, "I

saw things it is not lawful for a man to utter." We need to get a new set of eyes and a new set of ears. We need to new sensory organs if we are to understand everything that God has for us. God has given us very limited capacities down here on earth. We can understand and see a few things, but God is by no means limited by our five senses and their limited range.

As I was thinking on this subject, I wrote a poem to try to explain this, comparing blind men and atheists.

Two blind men argued well into the night
about the great question, "Is there really sight?"
Said one to the other (and quite fervently)
"There cannot be colors or else we could see!
So take red and green and blue off the list.
If I cannot see them, they must no exist.
A crazy man told me the sky is bright blue.
I listened intently but I caught no clue
of anything out there to alter my mind.
I'm not deaf you know, I here perfectly fine.
Be quiet and listen, and then you will know
that colors aren't real. How dare they say so?
They tell me that grass is some sort of green.
It looks like the rest of the world that I've seen!
It tastes a lot different than jelly or cheese
(if I smell it too long it sure makes me sneeze).
It feels a lot different that ice cream or snow
but to say that it's green? I'd have to say no.
I will not believe it until I have seen.
There isn't a difference 'twixt red, blue or green!!
And so the men argued with all of their might,
and I couldn't show them that they were not right.
They cannot see colors because they re blind!
But I couldn't get the truth in their mind.
Until they are given the great gift of sight;
never, not ever, will they see the light.

Two atheists argued (on university sod)
about the great question "Is there a God?"
Said one to the other (and quite fervently)
"There can't be a God or else we could see.
So take that old Bible and God off the list.
If I cannot see Him, He must no exist.
Be quite and listen, and then you will know
that God is not real, how dare they say so??

A crazy man told me God lives up in Heaven.
I used to believe that when I was just seven.
But now that I'm older and wiser you see,
I will not believe it. You can't prove it to me.
I cannot sense God with sight taste or smell.
I do not believe in Heaven or Hell!
I've never heard God or felt Him at all.
If He's really up there, I wish He would call."
I said, "Listen fellows, you're spiritually blind.
You've only five entrances into your mind.
That limits your input. I wish you could see.
You can't fathom God or eternity.
There are lots of things that really are real.
It doesn't disprove God because you can't 'feel'."
So you two can argue the rest of the night.
There's no way to show you that you are not right.
When you get to Heaven (or Hell if you please)
you'll understand God as you fall on your knees!
I wish you could see Him or hear Him somehow.
But that isn't possible where you are now.
To deny His existence is really absurd.
You'll have to believe Him and trust in His Word.

That is the way I see it. We have to admit by
faith that God exists because we are limited in our senses.
A blind person believes by faith that there are colors. He
has never seen them, but he believes by faith that they
exist because everyone has told him about them. I believe
by faith that there is a God. I believe that there is no
time in heaven.

People ask, "Where was God before the creation?
How long did God wait before the Garden of Eden, before He
created man?" Well, you are back into the same argument.
God didn't wait any time at all. There wasn't any time and
I can't explain it other than to say, that's the way it is.

It's been explained like this. Once upon a time
there was a time when there was no time. God didn't wait a
long time before creating Adam and Eve. He started time

when He created the earth. To answer the question, "What did God do for billions of years?" There weren't billions of years before or after the creation. After this is over, we will go back to a different dimension (beyond our current capacity to understand) called eternity.

Back to the question, how old is the earth? According to the Bible times given in Genesis 5, 11, and the chronologies given in many other places in the Bible, the date for the creation was about 4000 B.C. By adding up the fact that Adam was 130 years old when Seth was born, and how old Seth was when his son was born, and so on, we can come up with a fairly accurate time. That would be about six thousand years ago. I'm not one of these fellows that says that Adam was created on April 7, at 4:00 p.m. I don't know the exact date. I would say that 4000 B.C. is probably within a couple of hundred of years. I contend that the earth is six or seven thousand years old. There may be some slight error. For instance, was Adam 130 and a half years old when Seth was born? Are the dates rounded off to the nearest year? Was it on his birthday when his son was born? Did they use a year like we us? Did they use a solar year--365 and a quarter days? Did they use a Hebrew calendar--360 days? There are some slight possibilities for some minor changes, but nothing that accounts for billions of years. There is no question that the Bible clearly teaches that the earth is young. Almost all Bible scholars of the past were persuaded that the

earth was young.

What happened? Why did Christians abandon the teaching that the earth is only 6000 yrs. old?

Many of the Christians in the late 1800's, after Darwin's book The Origin of Species came out, began to try to compromise the historic position of the church to adjust to Darwin's theory. They tried to blend the evolutionary theory with the Bible. They began to say that maybe there were billions of years in the Bible. Several compromise positions were created. One of these is known as the Gap theory. They tried to insert a gap between Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 1:2. I believed the Gap theory for quite some time. I had a Scofield Bible as a new Christian. It is an excellent Bible, but his notes are not inspired. Scofield said that there was a gap between verse one and verse two. In that gap, they claim that Satan fell from heaven and the earth was destroyed. In that supposed gap, we are told to put the great ages that the evolutionists proclaim as incontestable fact. We are told that there was a "pre-adamic" civilization that included all the dinosaurs. We are told that this civilization was destroyed when Satan fell from Heaven.

There are a number of problems with that theory. The first problem is: It would be deceitful for God to 'hide' millions of years in a gap like that and not make it known in other scriptures. Secondly, it would be against other scriptures in the Bible which indicate that a gap of

millions or billions of years couldn't be there. The Bible says a few verses later, in Genesis 1:5, "the evening and morning were the first day." Many modern translations of the Bible change the word 'the' to 'a' to try to overcome this conflict. If there was a lot of time before verse five, then verse 5 is telling a lie. Also, it says in Exodus 20:12 that God created the earth in six days.

Another problem with the Gap theory is the fact that it is contradicting Romans 5 where the Bible says that there was no death until Adam sinned. If there was some kind of pre-Adamic civilization with dinosaurs and giant men, or whatever they want to put in this supposed gap, they had to die when Satan fell from Heaven and the earth 'became' without form and void (as they read verse 2). The dinosaur fossils are still here on earth. We have the skeletons, so they did die. That would mean that the Bible is a lie in the New Testament where it says that there was no death until Adam sinned.

Probably the most serious contradiction the Gap theory proponents must overcome is the plain testimony of Jesus Himself. In Matthew 19:4 Jesus plainly said that the creation of Adam and Eve was the beginning. Was Jesus not aware of the 'gap' or was He lying to His followers? I absolutely do not believe in the Gap theory.

If there is indeed a gap between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2 where Satan fell, it would be only a gap of a few hours. This is because verse five says it was the first

day. There is no reason to try to put billions of years in the Bible's framework.

The theistic evolutionists have said that the six days of creation were actually epics, ages, or eons of years. II Peter 3:8, "A day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as a day with the Lord," is a commonly used verse to justify this compromise. This doctrine is silly if you actually analyze the argument. One reason the Day Age theory would be silly is to look at the sequence in which God created all things. If you look at the sequence of creation, you would see why this argument is not reasonable or scientific. God created the plants on day three before He created the sun on day four. If you think plants are going to survive for billions of years without the sun, you need to study more biology. I believe God did that on purpose to make us realize the days of creation were twenty-four hour days. He made the plants, herbs, trees, and grass on one day and on the next day He created the sun. The problem is further complicated when we realize that the insects to pollinate the plants were not created until day five. The Day Age Theory is another unnecessary attempt by worried Christians to try to please the evolutionists.

Let's look at another analogy regarding the age of the earth. Let's suppose you were to go out and find a sunken ship with a box of coins on that ship. When you open the box of coins, you find dates on the coins from all

different ages. If there is a coin in the box from 1850, right away you are limited to say that the ship sank after 1850. If you find a coin in the box from 1820, that doesn't mean that the ship sank around 1820, because you also have an 1850 coin in there. You are limited to the youngest date in the box. It may have sunk well after that, but it cannot have sunk before that. If there is a 1850 coin in the box and it is not a forgery, then the ship didn't sink in 1849. The same analogy is true when trying to determine the age of the earth.

There are many different ways that scientists try to test the age of the earth. There are probably five or six hundred ways to try to show the age of the earth. It is a very difficult thing to do conclusively. If a few of the methods to date the earth give old ages, but others give an age that is only a few thousand years old, as many do, then you have a dilemma. You must decide which you want to accept. Because many scientists want to believe evolution, they will, of course, select the few that seem to indicate great ages and ignore the evidences that indicate a young age of the earth. Taking only evidence that supports a preconceived idea and rejecting all other evidence is not very intelligent or scientific.

I will give just a few of the ways to show that the earth and solar system are young. I have a list put out by Henry Morris, of the Institute for Creation Research, a list of seventy-six things that show the age of the earth

to be very young. Here are just a few of the evidences of a young earth given by Dr. Morris: 1. The influx of cosmic dust to the earth indicates that the earth is less than 10,000 yrs. old. Most of this dust has washed into the soil. This cosmic dust that comes from outer space, contains a high percentage of nickel. Scientists have searched and searched for the nickel content in the earth's crust. The amount of nickel is not great enough to account for billions of years. It only accounts for several thousand years. For instance, the influx of Helium 4 into the atmosphere indicates something less than 175 thousand years. 2. Radiometric decay produces helium which has to escape into the atmosphere. By measuring the helium content in the atmosphere, we conclude that there could not have been radioactive decay for billions of years because there isn't enough helium in the atmosphere. The percentage of helium in the atmosphere indicates a very young earth. Evolutionists are searching for a way for the helium to escape into outerspace to eliminate this evidence for a young earth, so far no method has been found.

Another evidence that the earth is young is the fact that there are still meteors and comets flying through space. We know that comets and meteors break up and decay as they pass through the solar system. We have never seen one formed, that is, get bigger or larger. We have seen many break up and fall apart. As comets circle around the solar system they come close to the earth or different

planets. The gravitational forces of these planets break pieces off the comets and they fragment or fall apart. How long could a comet circle through our solar system before it would disintegrate or run into a planet? Several astronomers have said that ten thousand years is the longest a comet could survive going through our solar system time and time again (like Haley's Comet does every seventy years) before it would disappear. If this figure is correct, why do we still have comets? The fact that we have comets at all indicates that the earth is still very young. Scientists that have analyzed this problem have come up with the "Comet Bank Theory." They speculate that somewhere in outer space there is a bank of comets. Every once in a while something will check some out and distribute them throughout the universe. I'm making fun of them of course, this is not exactly what they believe. They say that the comets are supplied from another source, they don't know what the source is, but we keep getting comets because of this "Comet Bank." The very existence of short period comets is one of the proofs of a young earth.

Another evidence that the earth is young is fact that the earth's spin is gradually diminishing. The diminishing spin is very minor, just a second a century we are losing. One second per day per century is not significant in a short time frame of only a few thousand years. If you interpret that over of billions of years, however, it would mean that the earth was spinning so fast

that no life could have been possible due to the shorter days, centrifical force, earth quakes and high winds created. The declining spin of the earth is another fact that indicates a young earth.

The earth's magnetic field is declining. Dr. Thomas G. Barnes, a professor of physics at the University of Texas in El Paso, claims that the earth's declining magnetic field is a powerful indication that the earth is extremely young. He is considered by many to be one of the world's experts on the subject. His studied opinion is that this bit of scientific data would limit the earth's age to less than 25,000 years.

If we can prove that the earth is young, only six or seven thousand years old, that really ends the argument of evolution. Evolutionists will fight tooth and nail to be able to hold to the faulty idea that the earth is billions and billions of years old. When a number of scientific attempts to establish some kind of age for the earth prove that the earth is really very young, reasonable people should accept the facts. Of course, evolutionists would jump at anything that would indicate that the earth is billions and billions of years old because it is such a vital part of their theory.

Someone would say, "What about stars? We know that they are billions of light years away." I don't want to sound like a crackpot, but actually we don't know that stars are billions of years away. There are two, maybe

three methods of determining how far away the stars are. One of these methods is just simple trigonometry. However, when you get to extremely minute angles, it is very difficult to measure anything less than a couple of arc-seconds accurately. You cannot measure distances accurately more than sixty to one hundred light years away. Not sixty to one hundred million light years, just sixty to one hundred light years. The other method that used is called the "Red Shift" method. We will discuss this in more detail later.

How old is the earth? I believe that the earth is only six to seven thousand years old. I taught high school science for fourteen years, and for three years taught college level science. I'm convinced that much of our modern science, especially relating to evolution, is an absolute joke. We are in the same position as the people in the days before Columbus, when people were teaching that the earth was flat, or when they taught the doctrine of humors or draining blood to cure illnesses, and many other wrong conclusions of science. They were very wrong. Science has a long history of being dogmatically wrong.

I believe that one of the areas in science and the Bible that needs to be re-studied is the critical issue of the age of the earth. This will prove to be the undoing of the doctrine of evolution.

The hypothesis of evolution has had pre-eminence in our public teaching for about the last thirty to forty

years. Darwin's book published in 1860 really started the controversy going. There have been groups teaching evolution for several thousand years. The Egyptians taught a form of evolution, saying that life evolved from the slime along the Nile River. Today we trace our modern evolutionary movement to Darwin. Darwin's book became almost universally accepted within ten years of its release in 1860. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, it was extremely difficult to combat this teaching of evolution. Archaeological finds were not complete and Darwin claimed that there were thousands of intermediate species between the major kinds that we find today. He said that it was a matter of time before these missing links were dug up. It has been 130 years now, and the missing links are still missing. I believe that the earth is young and Darwin's theory is not only unscientific, it is absolutely stupid. To believe that all of this complicated life in this complicated universe came about just by the random shaking of molecules demands an awful lot more faith than I have.

I believe that the earth was created in six literal days, not eons or eons of time like the Living Bible says in the notes given in Genesis 1. It says that each day was a period of time. There is no evidence of that and Ken Taylor needs to re-examine the evidence for that. I believe that the current teaching of evolution that is going on in our public schools and public universities has spawned a great number of social evils. For instance,

Communism is a direct offshoot of evolution.

If a frog turns into a prince instantaneously, we call that a miracle or a fairytale. But, if that frog turns into a prince very slowly, taking three or four hundred millions years to make the transition, we will teach that in our universities as scientific fact.

Let me give you just a few evidences that the earth is young. First of all the coral reefs that are growing off of the coast of Australia is growing at a certain rate. People have said that the growth of the coral reefs ought to show us how old the earth is. With study, they discover that under certain conditions, coral grows extremely fast. Other under conditions, they grow very slowly. So the rate of growth is very difficult to determine. To prove that it happened at a constant rate. Right after the Flood, as all of the water went down, all of the decayed plant matter would have made the water very high in minerals and decayed plant and animal life would have been high in nutrients to make anything to grow. Food would have been readily available with all of the rotting carcasses of the vegetation and the animals. The coral could have grown much faster under these conditions, then it would have slowed down to its current rate. People who have studied coral reefs say that they could have been formed in four to five thousand years with no problem. If the earth is older than that, why aren't the the coral reefs much larger? Their rate of growth indicates a young age for the earth.

The Bristle Cone pine trees, the red trees, and the sequoia trees in California. The guides in California say that there is no reason that any of these trees should ever die. Apparently, they will live until some disease attacks them. If they are protected from disease, they will just keep on growing, adding a ring every year. One way, of course, to tell how old a tree is is to drill a core sample and count the rings. The Bristle Cone pine tree grows extremely slow. By the time a tree is one hundred years old, it is not quite one inch in diameter. To count a hundred rings in a half inch is difficult and must be done with a microscope. Counting rings is a little more difficult than just sawing the tree down and looking at it. The Bristle Pine trees indicate an age of about four thousand years maximum. If the earth is millions of years old, why don't we have a fifty thousand year old Bristle Cone Pine tree someplace or a half a million year old? The age of the oldest living thing in the biosphere, the Bristle Cone Pine, indicates a young age for the earth. The evolutionists don't look at that one because that doesn't support their theory.

The pressure in oil wells in Texas is another indication that the earth is young. I lived five years in Texas. I saw a flame shooting up in the sky one night and went over to investigate. There were some men burning off the natural gas as they were drilling an oil well. I began asking them questions, talked about the oil there in

Longview, Texas, they told me that they have a blowout protector that they put about a thousand feet down in the ground in case they drilled into a pocket of pressure. I asked them what kind of pressure they were talking about, how much pressure is the oil under down there in the ground. When drilling down about 35 hundred feet, often the oil has twenty thousand pounds of pressure per square inch. If you have ever pumped up a bicycle tire to seventy or eighty pounds of pressure, you understand that it is pretty hard to do. That pressure would crack the rock in the strata because after a period of time the rock could only withstand the pressure for so long. Some scientists spent quite a bit of time studying different rock strata that oil is found in and the strata that the oil is found under, and try to determine how long the oil could withstand the intense pressure that it was under. Melvin Cook did quite a bit of study on this. The studies indicated that the oil could not have been under that pressure for more than ten thousand years. The fact that the oil is still under that pressure indicates that it has been down there less than ten thousand years. Often when they first began drilling oil wells in the early 1930's, they would hit that pocket of pressure and it would blow everything up out of the ground. The thirty or forty thousand feet of pipe would just be shot up out of the ground like spaghetti because of this intense pressure. I would like to ask the evolutionists if he has some kind of

answer to the fact that if the earth is indeed million of years old, why is the oil still under such incredible pressure? Why hasn't it dissipated into the rock, and formed cracks, and leaked out through the years?

Another evidence that the earth is young instead of millions of years old is the sediment in the ocean. A friend of mine out in California brought me a slab of what looked like a piece of polished marble, about the size of a small tabletop. He said, "Mr. Hovind, I brought this to you because I thought you might be interested in it." I asked him what it was and he said that it was a slab of ocean floor. He said that he went down, blew the sediment away with a jet of high speed water, and then cut a slab of the rock out of the ocean floor. The sediment in the ocean is only a certain thickness. The thickness of the sediment could be accumulated in about thirty or forty thousand years at the current rate that sediment is being deposited. If the earth is millions of years old, why isn't the sediment thicker? This a question that evolutionists can't answer or avoid, because they only looking for evidences that would seem to indicate a great age of millions or billions of years. Anything that would seem to be troublesome to their ridiculous theory they simply avoid. The ocean sediment indicate a young age for the earth. Of course, the rate of the deposition of sediment is always a factor that must be considered. Right after a world-wide flood, quite a bit of sediment would accumulate just right

there. That is why if you get an age of twenty-five or thirty thousand years at our current rate of deposition, it is possible that the first seventy percent was accumulated in a few years after the flood. Then the rate of deposition would have dropped to where today it would look like thirty thousand years, but actually could be accounted for in four thousand years.

The erosion of the continents indicates a young earth. At the current rate of erosion we are losing a lot of ground to the oceans. New Orleans, for instance, is built on sediment that has come down from Illinois. The major river systems have been tested fairly carefully a number of times to see how much sediment they are bringing out every year, how much material is being transported. At the current rate of erosion the continents would erode down to sea level in fourteen million years. The mountains would be gone and the entire earth would be a swamp. If the evolutionist is going to say that we have 140 million years since the time of the dinosaurs, that is enough time for the earth to erode away ten times. So they come up with the theory of the continental lifting, plate tatonics (the plates shifting around), the subduction of the earth, the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, all of these may have some validity, but the rate of erosion proves that the earth is not 140 million years old. My explanation would be that most of the erosion, the formation of mountain ranges and Grand Canyon, was formed after the Flood as the water went

down. Then the current of erosion would be misleading, and the earth would be only four to five thousand years old since the Flood happened. The rate of erosion is a good evidence for a young earth.

The moon is receding. As you measure the distance to the moon, it can be seen that every year the moon gets a little bit further away. If you calculate that backward in time, you should be able to calculate approximately when the moon began to leave or was captured in our orbit. I do not believe that the moon was captured. Some people say that the moon started as a part of the Pacific Ocean and was pulled out of that area. That was taught for many years and is still believe by some. They try to use that to explain all of the volcanoes in Hawaii, saying that the crust is very thin because the moon was pulled out. The rate that the moon is receding, travelling away from the earth, indicates a very young age for the earth. Thomas G. Barnes, a professor of physics at the University of Texas-El Paso, said,

It takes but one proof for a young age for the moon or the earth to completely refute the doctrine of evolution.

That initial statement is worth thinking about. "If there is one proof." That is really all you need, just one proof. He goes on to say,

One can see through simple laws of physics that the moon should be receding from the earth. From the same

laws, one can show that the moon could never have survived a nearness to the earth less than 11,500 miles.

If the moon were any closer the tidal forces on the earth on a satellite that size would cause extreme damage to the satellite or to the earth, like the rings of Saturn. So the moon was never closer than 11,500 miles is Barnes' contention. The present speed of recession of the moon is known. If one multiplies the recession speed by the presumed evolutionary age, the moon should be much farther from the earth than it is, even if it started out from the earth.

There is as yet no tentable alternative explanation that would yield an evolutionary age of four billion years of the moon. Here is as simple solution as science can provide that the moon is not as old as scientists claim. This is a very serious problem. Many physicists that believe in evolution understand the problem. For instance, Dr. Louis Slitter, professor of geophysicist at Massachusetts Institute for Technology, said, "The time scale of the earth/moon problem still present a major problem." Well, it doesn't present a major problem for me. He understands the the earth/moon system is a serious problem. The moon is receding and does not indicate a great age for the earth. The age of the whole solar system is a real problem to the evolutionists. Lord Kelvin used the changing spin rate of the earth and with his mathematics proved that because of the changing spin the

earth could not be billions of years old. He said that the earth had to be down in the range of thousand of years.

There are many Christians who try to pacify the evolutionists. They came up with several different alternatives. One was the "Day Age Theory". This said that the days mentioned in Genesis are really periods of time or evolutionary ages. This is where many of the modern translations of the Bible go bad because they change slight little phrases in Genesis 1. Get out different translations and compare how they treat Genesis 1. The King James Version says, "it was the first day." It uses the definite article the. Many other versions of the Bible use the article a. They will say that this was a first day, and a second day. That little subtle change is just an attempt to allow for the "Day Age Theory." Ken Taylors' Living Bible, I don'te garbage heap. want to be too negative because there are many good things about it, in Genesis has an attempt to pacify the evolutionists by trying to include billions of years into the Bible framework. They do that by perverting the Scripture. The Scripture teaches that it was the first day, and it was six literal days, not six periods of time. God told Moses later in Exodus 20:12 in the Ten Commandments "for in six days God created the heavens and the earth." Moses would have been a liar. Jesus obviously taught in a young earth and an instantaneous creation. He talked about Adam and Eve being created, "God created them, male and female." So

Jesus would be a liar also if evolution were true.

There are some evidences that the earth is young. Most cultures that are found in the world tell of a world-wide flood in the last five to six thousand years. The population of the earth today doubles regularly. If you were to draw up the population growth on a chart you would see that it goes back to zero about five thousand years ago. If man has been here millions of years like evolutionists teach, where is the population? The whole population growth can be studied by anyone and it will be found that the population of the earth dates a young age for the earth of four to five thousand years. Since the Flood started with eight people. All of the ancient writings that we have show a young age of the earth. Why don't we have people writing about kings that lived fifty thousand years ago? Why is it that all of recorded history happened in the last four thousand years?

These honest questions deserve an honest answer. I believe we have been lied to about the age of the earth. Satan, the father of all lies, has come up with this one to try to make a fool of Jesus Christ. Jesus said in Matthew 19:4 that the creation of Adam and Eve was the beginning. I believe Jesus was right.